

JAN 5 1931

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

PERMANENT
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. A. C. OLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.
L. WHIBLEY, M.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,
representing the Council
of the Classical
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary) representing
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. E. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLIV

DECEMBER, 1930

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	209	REVIEWS (continued) :	
A SCHOOL IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT. E. NORMAN		<i>Les Argonautiques d'Orphée</i> (Dottin). M. M.	
GARDINER	211	GILLIES	232
NOTES ON THE GREEK PARTICLES. J. D.		<i>Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems</i>	
DENNISTON	213	(Mozley). D. W. LUCAS	233
ARISTOPHANES, <i>Wasps</i> 436-7. A. Y. CAMPBELL	216	<i>Tibull-Studien</i> (Schuster). D. W. LUCAS	233
EPITHETS IN THE ORPHIC HYMNS. W. K. C.		<i>Appendix Vergiliana</i> (Vollmer-Morel). A. E.	
GUTHRIE	216	HOUSMAN	234
THE GAP IN THE <i>Pro Flacco</i> . T. B. L.		<i>P. Ovidii Nasonis Fasti</i> (Frazer), (Landi).	
WEBSTER	221	C. BAILEY	235
CICERO AND THE <i>LEX GABINIA</i> . J. A.		<i>Étude sur le Style des Discours de Tite Live</i>	
DAVISON	224	(Ullmann). S. K. JOHNSON	240
NUGAE ELEGIACAE. H. RACKHAM	225	<i>Die Harmonielehre des Klandios Ptolemaios</i>	
CHERSONESUS TAURICA. E. H. MINNS	226	(Düring). J. F. MOUNTFORD	242
REVIEWS :		<i>Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik</i>	
<i>The Ancient Explorers</i> (Cary and Warmington).		(Helm). J. K. FOTHERINGHAM	243
M. P. CHARLESWORTH	226	<i>Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung</i>	
<i>The Administration of Justice from Homer to</i>		(Herrlinger). A. M. DUFF	244
<i>Aristotle</i> (Bonner and Smith). M. CARY	227	<i>Byzantinische Dichtung</i> (Soyter). R. M.	
<i>Two Theocritus Papyri</i> (Hunt and Johnson).		DAWKINS	244
A. S. F. GOW	228	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	245
<i>Cicéron: Des Termes extrêmes des Biens et des</i>		BOOKS RECEIVED	246
<i>Maux</i> , t. II. (Martha). H. RACKHAM	230	INDEX	247

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK : G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3
Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW
25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; inquiries to the Hon. Secretary, Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, 42, Lordswood Road, Harborne, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, 35, Mount Street, Liverpool; Professor F. S. Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. W. L. Cuttle, The University, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss W. A. Greatbatch, 150, Park Road, W. 4; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. D. E. F. Binyon, The University, Leeds; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, Christ Church, Oxford; Miss C. Keith, St. Hilda's College, Oxford; Miss W. A. Odell, Brighton and Hove High School for Girls, Brighton; Mrs. F. G. Maunsell, 123, University Road, Southampton; Professor F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Dr. G. H. Goldsmith, 6, Bromham Road, Bedford; Dr. M. M. Gillies, University College, Hull; Miss N. C. Jolliffe, The University, Reading; Mr. G. H. P. P. Tredennick, 34, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield; Mr. H. Hill, University College, Swansea; Mr. D. L. Hewitt, Wyggeston School for Boys, Leicester; and Mr. R. Dobbin, 326, Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand.

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

New Books ready December, 1930

Latin

246. *Bede: Stapleton's Translation.* Revised and
248. edited by J. E. KING. 2 vols.
239. *S. Augustine: Select Letters.* Translated
by J. H. BAXTER.

Greek

243. *S. Basil: Letters.* Translated by ROY
DEFERRARI. 4 vols. Vol. III.

Greek

238. *Demosthenes: Olynthiacs, Philippics, Leptines
and minor public Orations (I.-XVII and XX).*
Translated by J. H. VINCE.
244. *Lysias.* Translated by W. R. M. LAMB,
in one volume.
247. *Philo.* Translated by F. H. COLSON and the
REV. G. H. WHITAKER. 10 vols. Vol. III.

Machines or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library)

FREE together with Descriptive Prospectus, etc.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

nt and
s upon
ational
(c) to
create

annual
of 5s.
eedings
assical
assical
before
must

Hose,
ectory,
e, The
; Mr.
ollege,
Public
Road,
E. F.
; Miss
nham ;
; Miss
l, 123,
G. H.
Miss
Road,
School

y

site
are,

ines
(X).

MB,

the
III.

F
cele
tion
ciat
vari
and
Ass
on t
with
lege
lect
the
of t
of
Lo
two
by
Ita
we
wic
in
Eu
po
the
to
W
Pr
up
at
pe
an
co
pr
O
A
w
o
w
in
a
“
t
c
c
a
I
t
A
l

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1930

NOTES AND NEWS

FROM a correspondent :

'The Annus Vergilianus has been celebrated—apart from the participation of members of the Classical Association, led by Dr. Conway, in the various Italian celebrations, at Mantua and elsewhere—by activities of the Association and of its branches, whether on their own account or in conjunction with Universities and University Colleges. At various times during the year, lectures on Virgil have been given, for the most part open to the public, at all of these. Special mention may be made of a course of lectures arranged by the London branch in February and March, two of which, on "Virgil in France" by Madame Turguet and on "Virgil in Italy" by Professor Edmund Gardner, were of special interest as giving a wider outlook and connecting England, in history and culture, with the general European movement. Evidence of the popular interest in Virgil is afforded by the enormous audiences which listened to anniversary addresses by Professor W. B. Anderson at Manchester and by Professor O. L. Richmond at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Fresh ground was broken at Nottingham by the arrangement and performance of a Virgilian Interlude, and at Manchester by a prize for a competition in essays on Virgil by pupils of Lancashire Secondary Schools. Of the General Meeting of the Classical Association at Hull a principal feature was Professor R. M. Henry's address on "Virgil and Roman Civilisation," which is now printed in full in *Proceedings*; and this was supplemented by a paper from Dr. M. M. Gillies on "Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil." In the birthday week the Classical Association concentrated on providing, in conjunction with the British Academy and the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, three lectures, given at the Academy, on "Virgil as a Creative Artist" by Dr. Conway, on "Virgil and English Poetry" by the President of

Magdalen, and on "Virgil as a Master Mind" by Dr. J. W. Mackail. These lectures were delivered to crowded audiences and aroused much interest in circles beyond those of professional scholars. They will in due course be published by the Clarendon Press. The Classical Association may congratulate itself on having succeeded in giving a fresh impulse during the year to the cause of the Classics.'

From a somewhat different point of view the pages of the current volume of the *Classical Review* are eloquent of a renewed interest in Virgilian studies.

As we go to press comes Dr. Mackail's eagerly awaited edition of the *Aeneid*. There could be no more fitting *εξόδος* to the British *Iudi Vergiliani*.

Of the American celebrations we cannot tell the full tale, but evidence of them has come in the shape of notices of Virgilian exhibitions held at Public Libraries in New York and Newark, the Newark notice being accompanied by Virgilian passages choicely printed on cards. To the Fordham Preparatory School in New York City belongs the distinction of a Virgilian Edition of the school magazine.

FROM a correspondent :

'Dr. Norman Gardiner, whose death was recently announced, will be remembered primarily as a diligent and interesting specialist. Nearly thirty years ago he published his first contribution to the subject of Greek athletics, and the bulk of his work since then has been devoted to that subject. In his simple and detached manner he succeeded in classifying and analysing the various activities of Greek athletic festivals, as well as the normal contests of everyday university life in the Greek cities. His latest book, *Athletics of the Ancient World*, published only a few days before his death, is a

summary, in most readable form, of all his special studies. In it he covers the whole extent of athletics in antiquity from Minoan to Roman times.

'Special aspects of ancient life which necessitate a search through texts and monuments for the relevant material can, if handled in what one might call the "Privat-Docent manner," be of infinite dullness. In the hands of Dr. Gardiner such a study never failed to be attractive, if only because his style had that simplicity and clarity which is all too often absent from the work of the encyclopaedists who usually monopolise such subjects.

'In a word, Dr. Gardiner saved his theme from the Reallexicographers by making it a living and attractive subject. And with immense patience and research he added to his text illustrations that were invariably those essential to the matter: they were not just thrown into the text, as is so often the case with archaeologists who cannot envisage the difficulties of their readers. Dr. Gardiner's *Olympia* and *Athletics of the Ancient World* can be taken as ideal examples of the perfectly illustrated book.

'In his *Olympia* Dr. Gardiner embarked upon a project which involved the analysis of evidence that had been, for the most part, outside his usual sphere of study. But it must be admitted that his handling of such a difficult problem as the prehistoric settlement at Olympia is both adequate and interesting, despite the defects of the available evidence. The remainder of the book simplifies a complicated subject without at any stage degenerating into the guide-book manner. Its only defect, perhaps, is the disregard of the stylistic problems involved in an examination of the sculptures of the temple of Zeus, and, strangely enough, a failure to indicate their supreme position in Greek art.

'For the greater part of his life Dr. Gardiner was a schoolmaster at Epsom College. He was a graduate of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. His last book had the advantage of being written during the leisure of retirement, and, in consequence, is the fruit of a very profound and extensive research. It

leaves no scope for others in the field to which it is devoted.

'Dr. Gardiner's activities in the Classical Association are well enough known. As one of the Secretaries, he was both vigorous and sympathetic. In Roman archaeology, as in Greek, he was always ready to help and encourage all enterprise and research. His interesting but unassuming personality and his obvious dislike of controversy and polemics marked him out as an unusual man whom it was a privilege to have as a friend.'

In this issue we publish the last paper written by Dr. Gardiner. With the illuminating article on a Pisidian inscription long buried in Sterrett's *Wolfe Expedition*, which appeared in the *Classical Review* last year (p. 210), it illustrates the wide range of his reading, his alertness in the search for evidence, and the sobriety of his judgment. As Secretary of the Classical Association he found many ways of placing the *Classical Review*, and the interests of classical learning in the widest sense, in his debt.

My Recollections, by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (translated into English by Professor G. C. Richards), is a book of unusual interest to classical scholars, for besides being an intimate revelation of the personality of the doyen of Grecians it is a solid contribution to the history of German and international classical scholarship during the past half-century. The author writes frankly as a Prussian die-hard; the sympathies and antipathies of the Junker reach out from every page, and skulls are cracked on this or on that side of the German frontier with scholarly impartiality. The world has moved so far since those days that his Rectorial signature of 1915—*plerarumque in hoc orbe academiarum socius, e Parisina honoris causa electus*—will be re-read with a smile even in Paris; and we wish that the translator had not spoiled the effect of a fine denunciation of British war-time scholarship on p. 331 by disclosing the dull truth in a footnote. There are few who would have Wilamowitz, whether as scholar or as

writer, other than he is, and his style is well suited to portray a life of high adventure and rare achievement in Greek scholarship.

Professor Heisenberg of Munich vacates the editorial chair of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*—happily for this year only—and the thirtieth volume, edited by his colleague Dr. Dölger, takes the form of a Festgabe in honour of his sixtieth birthday. The volume, which contains articles by 112 writers, representing 19 countries, is not only a notable tribute of respect to the 'Leiter der deutschen Byzantinistik,' but a signal proof of the vitality of Byzantine studies, which have indeed been given a fresh lease of life in many quarters by the nationalist heart-searchings and political attachments which resulted from the war. This is not the place in which to attempt any analysis of the rich and varied contents of the Festschrift, which range in scope from the Homeric Question to the structure of the Gül Cami and in date from Constantine—and even Horace—to the nineteenth century. England is represented by ten contributors. The *Classical Review* takes the opportunity to add its sincere felicitations both to Professor Heisenberg and to Dr. Dölger.

FROM a correspondent :

'The citizens of Reggio di Calabria are to be congratulated on the appearance of a new publication, *L'Italia Antichissima*, which is to be devoted entirely to the antiquities and history of their district. The energetic director of the Reggio museum, Professor N. Putorti, in a disarming preface to the first fascicule, explains that the articles he has written and is writing for such publications as the *Rivista indo-greco-italica*, *Atti del I Congresso nazionale di Studi Romani*, *Cronache d'Arte*, *Historia*, etc., are not easily accessible in present-day Calabria; he is therefore reprinting them in uniform fascicules, of which two have now appeared. It is not a case of *dis κρίμνη*, for these second helps are not intended for those who enjoyed the first; the one apparent case of *τρίς* (or perhaps *τετράκις*) *κρίμνη* is justified by local circumstances. *L'Italia Antichissima* is an interesting attempt to deal with a difficulty that is not confined to patriotic Calabrians but common to all who have to work with learned periodicals. Perhaps in many cases a simpler and more satisfactory solution might be found in a liberal and organised distribution of offprints. Meanwhile there are many besides the fellow-citizens of Professor Putorti who will find *L'Italia Antichissima* a most useful publication.'

A SCHOOL IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT.

ATHLETICS in the third century B.C. was a profitable profession. Parents sending a boy to school would exhort the teacher to turn him into an athlete just as they sometimes today exhort the schoolmaster to teach their boys cricket, though not for quite the same motive. Of this we have an interesting illustration in one of the Zenon papyri (Cairo Papyri, 59060). It is a letter written by one Hierocles, apparently the keeper of a palaestra, to Zeno, the agent of a wealthy landowner, Apollonius, under Ptolemy Philadelphus. The date is 257 B.C. Zeno has sent a boy named Pyrrhus to Hierocles' palaestra in Alexandria. He has written to Hierocles telling him, if he is sure that the boy

will win a victory, to go on training him; otherwise not to incur useless expense or keep the boy from his 'letters.' Hierocles replies that only the gods can be certain if the boy will win, but that Ptolemaeus, the trainer, thinks the boy is promising and will soon excel the boys in training (*τῶν ἀλειφομένων*). He is not neglecting his letters; 'and I hope,' he adds, 'that with the help of the gods *you* will very soon be crowned.' The letter ends with a request to Zeno to send the boy various articles of clothing, and bedding and some honey. There are three copies existing of this letter, which must have been considered important. From another letter from Hierocles, written a

year later (59098), it seems that Zeno has suggested sending Pyrrhus to another school. It is clear, then, that Zeno has undertaken the cost of the boy's education and that his generosity is not wholly disinterested. If the boy wins, says Hierocles, I hope that *you* will be crowned, *i.e.* you will get the prize in whole or in part. If the boy confines himself to his letters, he will doubtless prove of service to Zeno in other ways.

Now who was this Pyrrhus? Rostovtzeff, in his *Great Estate in Egypt*, p. 174, suggests that he is a slave, because he is described as a *παιδάριον*. Preisigke, in his *Wörterbuch*, defines *παιδάριον* as *Sklave, Knecht, Diener*. I submit that in the third century B.C. the word *παιδάριον* is not so limited, but merely means 'a young boy,' and that apart from the context we are no more justified in assuming that a *παιδάριον* is a slave than we should be justified in assuming that an Englishman in the East, using the word 'boy' in a letter, necessarily means thereby 'a servant.' In the fourth century, less than a century earlier, Demosthenes uses the phrase *ἐκ παιδαρίου* in the sense of 'from early boyhood.' A study of the passages of the Zenon papyri where the word is used reveals that, while the *παιδάρια* employed on farms or in the household may or may not be slaves, there are certain passages where the word is undoubtedly used of a free boy (*e.g.* 59347). Forced labour was part of Egyptian tradition, and there was an abundant supply of it: but forced labour is not slavery, and slavery seems to have been of little importance in Egyptian economy under the Ptolemies.

What is the context here? Zeno is sending Pyrrhus to a Greek palaestra and hopes he will win a victory in some of the Greek games, such as the Ptolemaea. The Greeks in Egypt were a very exclusive community, and it is surely inconceivable that a slave should be admitted to a palaestra, or to compete in the Sacred Games. Indeed, the Zenon papyri leave us in no doubt. The palaestra in question is probably that referred to in another letter (*P.S.I.* 340), a palaestra in which Zeno and Apollonius appear to be interested. In

this letter the boys are described as *παιδάρια*. Still more convincing is a letter written in 250 B.C. by a certain Rhodo to Paranomus (59298). The latter is a *ὄπλομάχος*, or *maître d'armes*, one of those who taught the use of arms in the Gymnasia. Rhodo sends greetings to Paranomus and his pupils (*τοῖς παιδαρίοις*). Paranomus, being a fencing-instructor, is a Greek. In another letter (59488) he asks Zeno to buy him in Memphis twelve strigils of Sicyonian workmanship—six for men, six for boys. It is inconceivable that Paranomus should give instruction in the use of arms to slaves or, indeed, to any but free-born Greeks, and that Rhodo should send greetings to Paranomus and his slaves.

The name Pyrrhus is strangely rare, but it is found in Macedon, and frequently in Ptolemaic Egypt, which was full of Macedonian soldiery, Greeks or semi-Greeks. In the Zenon papyri we find one Pyrrhus described as a farmer, another as a hunter, another as keeper of the prison, others employed on farms. We know that the Ptolemies distributed their soldiers throughout the country districts of Egypt, giving them land to cultivate. Many of these soldiers must have been poor men, and their families must have been often in need, and we can hardly suppose that they would reject any work as menial. To this class belongs the boy Pyrrhus. If we may identify him as Rostovtzeff does with the Pyrrhus who wrote another letter to Zeno (*P.S.I.* 443), his father was dead. Unfortunately the letter is not dated. In it he complains that for some time he has not received his allowance or his corn ration or his oil. Moreover, his mother has not received her allowance and had to pawn her *himation* to pay for his journey to Alexandria.

It seems, then, that those poor Greeks were recognised as having a claim on the generosity of great landowners like Apollonius or his agents. Of this we have an illustration in a letter from another *Graeculus esuriens* called Pyro (*P.S.I.* 418). He reminds Zeno that he has promised to do what he can for him and asks him to fulfil his promise by seeing that his son is clothed and

sent to a small school, and also to provide himself with the necessary food and oil and anything else he thinks good to give, 'that I may keep up a better appearance in future' (*ὅπως πανσώμεθα ἀσχημονούντες*), and not to treat 'me like common gamblers when waiting for admission and let the boys drive me off (*ἀποπαιδαριούν*)¹ in my nakedness.' 'If,' he continues, 'a woollen cloak (*τριβώνιον*)

¹ This I suggest is the meaning of the otherwise unknown word *ἀποπαιδαριούν*, of which the Italian editors can find no explanation. In a large household many *παιδάρια*, free boys as well as slaves, were employed, and it would be their duty to drive away beggars or other undesirables who sought admission. Mr. W. H. Buckler suggests to me another possible interpretation of *ἀποπαιδαριούν*, 'to treat as a

is too expensive, let me have a piece of linen (*ὀθόνιον*) till we can manage to get a *himation*.' His pathetic insistence on the need of keeping up appearances is just what we should expect from a Greek in Egypt; so, too, is his request that the boy should be sent to a Greek school. It was surely the interest of a Greek landowner like Apollonius that the Greeks on his estate should be properly educated and keep up the prestige of Hellas. And it was probably for their sakes that he established a palaestra in Alexandria.

E. NORMAN GARDINER.

boy and drive away.' Small boys would naturally hang about at the doors of the rich, and as naturally would be chased away.

NOTES ON THE GREEK PARTICLES.

(1) Οὐκουν . . . γε.

My remarks in C.R. XLIII 118 need supplementing.

γε has been restored in two passages which I had overlooked. Soph. *Ant.* 321 οὐκουν τό γ' ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας ποτέ (τό γ' Reiske: τόδ' codd.): Eur. *Hel.* 124 οὐκουν ἐν Ἀργεῖ γ' οὐδ' ἐπ' Εὐρώτᾳ ῥοαῖς (<γ> Musgrave). Both emendations are generally accepted and may be regarded as certain: hence their inclusion strengthens, not weakens, my argument.

In two other passages *γε* is, I think, required.

(i) Aesch. *Supp.* 392. The king has suggested that the maidens' best course is to plead before an Egyptian court that their cousins have no *κύρος* over them. The maidens reply: Μή τί ποτ' οὐν γενόμεν ὑποχείριος κράτεσιν ἀρσένων. A connective force of *οὐν* seems inappropriate here. Paley, troubled by the particle, suggests *μήποτέ νυν*. 'οὐν, impatiently, seeing their case here is weak: "Well, all we have to say is. . . ." So in the formulae ἀλλ' οὐν . . . γε and δ' οὐν' (Tucker). According to this, *οὐν* is 'adverbial,' not connective, and *μή . . . οὐν* is an emphatic negative. If so, on my view, it needs to be supplemented by a limitative *γε*, which is appropriate enough in the context; *γενόμεν γ'*, or better, perhaps *κράτεσί*

γ': 'In any case (*i.e.* whether I take the course you suggest or another) may I never become subject to the detested male.' For οὐκουν . . . γε in Aeschylus cf. *P.V.* 324, 518. For μή οὐν . . . γε cf. Thuc. VIII 91. 3. For the separation of *οὐν* from the negative I can only quote οὐκ ἂν οὐν (Xen. *Cyr.* III iii. 50: *Lac. Pol.* V 9). But μή τί ποτ' is almost a single word: and the separation is far less violent than the (unparalleled) separation of οὐ μήν from ἀλλά in Eur. *I.T.* 630 οὐ μήν, ἐπειδή τυγχάνεις Ἀργείος ὄν, ἀλλ' ὦν γε δυνατόν οὐδ' ἐγὼ λείψω χάριν.

(ii) Thuc. III 113. 4 οὐκουν τὰ ὅπλα ταυτὶ φαίνεται, ἀλλὰ πλέον ἢ χιλίων. It seems impossible to take *οὐν* as connective here. 'οὐκ οὐν leitet die Folgerung aus dem, was vor Augen liegt, ein: "nun denn, das siehst du," etc.' (Steup). 'These arms here then are, you see . . . ' (Arnold). 'These arms then do not look like it' (H. F. Fox). 'Apparet vero haec non esse arma eorum' (Stahl). (But what *vero* means here, I cannot conceive.) 'Why,' Crawley: which makes sense, but when could *οὐν*, in a statement, be rendered 'why'? (In a question, of course, it often can.) Kalinka (in *Dissertationes Philologicae Vindobonenses*, II 184) took οὐκουν as equivalent to οὐδαμῶς. On my view, this is impossible without a

following γε: and, further, γε is required by the sense: οὐκουν τά γ' ὅπλα ταυτὶ φαίνεται ('Anyhow, these arms don't look like the arms of zoo'). A glance at the arms indicates, as far as it goes, that the dead are more numerous.

(A subsidiary question. λείπει τὸ διακοσίων εἶναι μόνον (Schol.). It would perhaps be rash to reject this as impossible, in colloquial Greek: that Valla translates διακοσίων proves nothing. But there is plausibility in Krueger's suggestion that σ' (διακοσίων) has fallen out before φαίνεται. As an alternative remedy, I would suggest ταυτὶ <τοσαῦτα>.)

The conclusions of this investigation may be summed up as follows. After οὐκουν, conveying an emphatic negative, γε should be added in those cases where the texts do not give it (1) because these cases are so few as to arouse suspicion; (2) because γε is everywhere demanded, more or less imperatively, by the sense. Suidas' οὐκουν· οὐδαμῶς is, then, true as far as it goes; but it does not go far enough.

(In Aesch. P.V. 520 M's οὐκ ἂν οὖν πύθοιο, a reading not mentioned in the Oxford text, is by common consent rejected.)

(2) Eur. Alc. 1126-7 (see C.R. XLIII 118).

The shift from physical to mental vision in ὁράς, ὁρῶ is paralleled in Eur. El. 567-8 βλέψον... δέδορκα. Electra clearly means the Old Man to take δέδορκα in the physical sense at first, until she rounds on him with μὴ σύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῆς. Victorius' δέδοικα spoils everything.

(3) οὐκοῦν δῆ.

In Lysias XXIX 4 the MSS. read: οὐκοῦν δῆ οὐχ ὡς ζημωθησόμενον αὐτὸν τριήραρχον κατέστησεν, ἀλλ' ὡς ὠφελῆθησόμενον. There is nothing suspicious in οὐκοῦν followed by a negative (Dem. XVI 4: Aeschin. I 159: Hyp. Phil. 10): nor in the combination οὐκοῦν δῆ in itself: for, though the only other example is, I believe, Plat. Rep. 459 E, combinations of particles are not suspicious merely because they are rare, and the two passages might be held to support each other mutually. Nor,

again, is it a serious objection to the text that οὐκοῦν is rare in early prose (IV 5 being the only other example in the Lysianic corpus), while οὐκουν is common.

The suspicion lies here. οὖν δῆ is as noticeably frequent in some writers as it is noticeably absent from others. It is common in Herodotus and Plato, and found also in the Hippocratic writings, Xenophon, and Sophocles. It belongs, therefore, to Ionic and to those authors who, in their use of particles or in other ways, show an Ionic tinge. (Hence F. G. Schmidt was rash when he conjectured οὖν δῆ in Eur. fr. 909, 4.) The purest Attic use of particles is to be found in Aristophanes and the orators: among the orators Lysias is, admittedly, Attic *par excellence*, and it is not questioned that Or. XXIX is his work.

I suggest reading οὐκουν (or οὐκ οὖν) δῆπου γ'. It is hardly necessary to produce a parallel for οὐκουν δῆπου, since the two words are independent: 'Not, then, I presume.' But cf. Ar. Plut. 261 οὐκουν πάλαι δῆπου λέγω; For δῆπου γε cf. Dem. XX 167: LVII 65. The corruption is of the simplest. It would appear that οὐκ οὖν (*separatim*) was often written for οὐκουν. Join the words together, and you get, instead of a negative, a positive (οὐκοῦν), which has to be corrected by a following οὐ: and this is easily supplied from the end of δῆπου, leaving us with an odd π, which will not long survive, and a grammatically unobjectionable, but stylistically improbable, δῆ.

(4) Γὰρ in wishes.

Eur. Cys. 261 reads: ΣΙ. Ἐγώ; κακῶς γὰρ ἐξόλοι.—ΟΔ. Εἰ ψεύδομαι. On the strength of this passage it has been repeatedly stated (recently in the new Liddell and Scott) that γὰρ, apart from εἰ γάρ, can be used to 'strengthen a wish.' But one swallow does not make a summer: and other passages which might have been, but have not been, enlisted as reinforcements, can be comfortably explained otherwise.

On the other hand, it is difficult to give γὰρ a causal force here: though, with the aid of some mental gymnastics, it can be done. Thus Professor Misener, in her valuable article on 'The εἰ γὰρ

wishes' (*Class. Phil.* III 137-144): 'The imprecation substantiates the indignation voiced in ἐγὼ by a more emphatic expression of it.' It is not surprising, then, that γὰρ should have been suspected. In quite a number of passages γ' ἄρ, ἄρ', τᾶρ', δ' ἄρ should probably be read (e.g. Pind. *Isthm.* V 41, where metre as well as sense suggests ἄρ': see Mr. C. M. Bowra, *C.Q.* XXIV 178). Here, Kirchhoff's γ' ἄρ' gives good sense, 'Be damned to you, then,' γε being exclamatory, as often with adjectives and adverbs in answers. (In *Ar. Thesm.* 887, κακῶς τ' ἄρ' ἐξόλοιο κάξολεῖ γέ τοι, γ' ἄρ' or [τ'] ἄρ' should, I think, certainly be read. κάξολεῖ γέ τοι is an afterthought, 'and damned you will be, too,' hence a preparatory τε is unsuitable.) But there are further objections to the text, not removed by Kirchhoff's remedy.

The line is surely very flat. 'May you be damned.'—'Yes, if I am lying.' Further (a less subjective criticism) γε seems needed, if not actually indispensable, after εἰ, and someone would no doubt have added it long ago, if it had scanned, as Dobree added it in *Soph. Phil.* 105, Hermann in *Eur. H.F.* 551, and Elmsley in *Eur. Heracl.* 263. In the present passage it is, in fact, doubly needed, since it conveys not only an addition to the implied assent, but a limitative addition: 'Yes, if (but only if) I am lying.' (*Soph. Phil.* 1236 is similar in logic, but different, I think, in tone. See Jebb's admirable note.)

All difficulties are removed, and life given to the line, by making Odysseus' speech start at κακῶς. 'Yes, damn you if I'm lying' (γὰρ having its normal, confirmatory force). This is at first sight nonsense (which perhaps accounts for the wrong division of the line. In any case, our texts admittedly often go astray in this matter of division¹). But in the sequel, in a like spirit of vicarious self-sacrifice, Silenus swears on the heads of his 'naughty children whom he loves so dearly,' and they on his. It makes the game more amusing if everyone plays it.

¹ Until Imperial times change of speaker was merely marked by a lateral stroke. (See F. W. Hall, *Companion to Classical Texts*, p. 13.)

(5) Successive γὰρ clauses.

Eur. Or. 1091-4:

καὶ ξυνθανεῖν οὐδ' δεῖ με σοὶ καὶ τῇδ' ὁμοῦ.
ἐμὴν γὰρ αὐτὴν, ἥς <γε> λέχος ἐπήνεσα,
κρίνω δάμαρτα· τί γὰρ ἐρῶ κατὰ ποτὲ
γῆν Δελφίδ' ἐλθὼν . . . ;

This passage appears to have excited no comment. But the logic of it is not, on the surface, very satisfactory. Pylades gives, as an adequate reason for facing death, the fact that his fiancée is about to die. This seems to stress unduly the obligations entailed by a highly unromantic engagement. He then gives another and far more important reason, that if he deserted Orestes now he could never show his face in Delphi again. Both reasons are introduced by γὰρ. Now it has often been noticed that in certain passages successive γὰρ clauses have a common reference (though more commonly, of course, the second γὰρ clause substantiates the first). *Her.* VII 51-2 and *Thuc.* I 40. 5-6 (where the second γὰρ has puzzled scholiasts and editors) have been rightly so explained. No instances from the tragedians have (to the best of my knowledge) been cited: but I believe that we have here the key to *Soph. Aj.* 182-5, *El.* 179-80 and *Ant.* 659-62. (That all the examples are from Sophocles is not, perhaps, mere coincidence.) The present passage may, possibly, be similarly explained. But this seems, as I have suggested, to make Electra too prominent. That difficulty is removed by re-punctuating so as to make καὶ τῇδ' . . . δάμαρτα almost a parenthesis: 'I must, and die with you—and her, too: for she is as good as married to me—for what shall I say,' etc. For successive γὰρ clauses, of which the first is parenthetical, cf. *Hom. v* 305-6: *Soph. O.C.* 980-2; *Thuc.* I 91. 3: II 5. 4. In *Aesch. Ag.* 558-61 Verrall, by a re-punctuation very similar to the one I have suggested, has saved γὰρ in 560 and improved the sense. The returned soldier, appropriately enough, remembers the discomforts more vividly than the dangers, to which he gives only a passing thought.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College,
Oxford.

ARISTOPHANES, WASPS 436-7.

Bδ. ὦ Μίδα καὶ Φρόξ βοήθει δούρο καὶ Μασιντιά,
καὶ λάβεσθε τούτου καὶ μὴ μεθήσθε μηδενί·
εἰ δὲ μὴ, 'ν πέδαις παχείαις οὐδὲν ἀριστήσετε.

Χο. ὡς ἐγὼ πολλῶν ἀκούσας οἶδα θρίων τὸν ψόφον· 436
εἰ δὲ μὴ τούτων μεθήσεις, ἐν τί σοι παγήσεται.

THAT is what I propose to do with the two lines in question. Editors all assign 436 to Bdelycleon. So far as I can discover they are here following, not all of the eight MSS., but all except two, B and C, which have no 'Χο.' at either line. σοι of course refers, in any case, to one of the trio of 433, who have by now arrested Philocleon.

It is agreed that θρίων ψόφον denotes empty bluster (Schol.). In Bdelycleon's mouth it can only refer to the threat of the Chorus (delivered at Xanthias or Sosias) in 428-9; but even in the text that is surely too far off. And the appearance of the text is deceptive, because there is obviously a battle between the Wasps and the two slaves (αὐτῶν, 431), Xanthias and Sosias, in the interval 432-3. Moreover, as Bdelycleon's call for Midas, Phryx, and Masintyas to come and recapture his father shows that Xanthias and Sosias have by then got the worst of that battle, it is clear that he cannot refer to the previous threat of the Wasps as empty bluster. With my alteration, θρίων ψόφον refers simply and naturally to Bdelycleon's threat of the preceding line. Indeed, when the relations of the words and the balance of the sentences from μὴ μεθήσθε to παγήσεται are considered, the change, I submit, becomes no longer open to doubt. εἰ δὲ μὴ of 435 refers, of course, not to λάβεσθε

but to μὴ μεθήσθε, and means, according to the usual idiom, 'or if you do.' As the text is printed above, the Chorus's final εἰ δὲ μὴ . . . παγήσεται answers Bdelycleon's final εἰ δὲ μὴ . . . ἀριστήσετε in the way which the assonance would naturally indicate. Van Leeuwen actually finds between 436 and 437 the division between two scenes! His εἰ δὲ μὴ as the commencement of 'scena decima' is alone most unconvincing.

If anyone should now want further argument he will find it in the marked correspondence of the three-line speeches 430-2, 433-5, and 438-40, particularly of the latter two. Philocleon's invocation of Kekrops answers to Bdelycleon's summons of the three slaves.

It remains to note that—(i.) ὡς is exclamatory; for this (not unnaturally) with οἶδα, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1091 ὡς οἶδα μὲν ταῦτ', οἶδα δ' οὐχ ὅπως φράσω, where Wecklein's 'kausal' is disproved by the preceding ὦ τάλας ἐγώ (cf. e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 82, *El.* 1162-3). (ii.) πολλῶν ἀκούσας—'How well I recognise, from long experience, the sound of empty bluster!'—is appropriate in the mouths of old men (cf. 235-6), but unsuitable to Bdelycleon. Van Leeuwen refers it (he alone realising that he must) to Bdelycleon's having so often heard actual brushwood crackling in the fire, 'ut nihil iam me terreat istius modi fragor'; this is certainly pointless, and seems to me nonsense. The old men are derisive of the threats of a young martinet to the slaves of their coeval his father.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

EPITHETS IN THE ORPHIC HYMNS.¹

IN the discussions, none of them of great length, which the collection of hymns known as Orphic has from time to time aroused, comparatively little has been said about their most striking feature, the close-packed series of epithets of which they largely consist. It seems to have been generally, if sometimes tacitly, agreed that

the epithets have been heaped on this or that divinity without discrimination, and that consequently any general attempt to approach them as words more likely to have significance than not must be waste of time. Chr. Petersen, for instance, in his essay on the Hymns,² singled out a few which, he said, cannot be by the author of the majority of the collection, but are un-

¹ In this paper I am indebted for one or two suggestions to Professor A. D. Nock.

² *Philol.* 27, pp. 385 ff.

mistakably different 'indem sie nicht in der Art derselben die Prädikate häufen, sondern einen mehr individualisirten Inhalt haben.' One or two epithets have been taken out of the ruck when, as has so often happened in recent times, they have been found to coincide with some new epigraphical discovery and so support a theory of the locality or purpose of the hymns. So Otto Kern¹ mentions, for example, *παντοκράτειρα* to compare it with a magic tablet from Pergamum, or *εὐδυνάτος* for its parallel with an inscription from Imbros. Yet these and a few other isolated examples of the significance of an epithet have not led to the conclusion that the epithets might be worth a general study for their own sake, although the theory of the hymns as intended for actual use by a cult-society, which has now² generally discredited Lobbeck's original view of them as a purely literary work composed *animi causa*, would surely encourage one in that hope. It has been suggested,³ in view of the similarity which such strings of epithets present to those used in magic invocations, that the same purpose was served by these hymns, namely that of constraining a deity to appear perforce by mentioning all his names. This may well be true, but one might still suppose that some attention would be paid, not only to completeness, but also to appropriateness in attempting to secure the maximum efficacy for the spell.

In any case it will be our first task to try, by means of some examples, to show that the epithets are worthy of serious consideration, that it is not unreasonable to regard them as words with a meaning of their own like most other words,⁴ and then, if that attempt can be considered to have succeeded,

to look into them further and see what they have to tell us.

The first question, put in other words, is: are the epithets applied to a particular deity appropriate to that deity, or are they a confused mass which might just as well have been given to any other of those addressed in the eighty-odd hymns? This being the problem, it will be as well before going further to decide in what sense exactly we are going to use the word 'appropriate.' We shall not expect to find, in a work which cannot well have been composed before the beginning of our era, the clearly divided personalities of the Olympians of fifth-century Greece, but consider an epithet to have appropriateness if it could have been addressed in actual worship to the deity of a particular living cult in late Hellenistic or Roman times, in an age when we may say that a certain amount of syncretism, of the blending and exchange of divine epithets, had already taken place, but not to such an extent that the separate titles of divinities had lost their individual significance. That is to say, if one finds, in an address to a certain deity, an epithet commonly the property of another, and wishes to defend the author from the charge of perpetrating a meaningless jumble of names, he must be prepared to show some definite grounds for believing that those two deities were in fact associated in the mind of a Graeco-Roman devotee. That way lies the onus of proof.

Suppose, then, we take the hymn to Athena (No. 32 Abel) as a field of small compass in which to try out this method of approach, and then judge whether its possibilities are worth exploring further. I should perhaps mention that this is not one of those marked out by Petersen as 'von der übrigen Mehrzahl unverkennbar verschieden,' to which I have referred above. It would of course be foolish to deny that the gods have by this time, and especially in the Orphic literature, with which, even though not exclusively, these hymns show an affinity, become larger, higher powers in the thought of men, and lost some of their semi-human personality in their promotion to more influential cosmic figures. The

¹ *Geneth. für Robert*, Berlin, 1910, pp. 94, 96.

² Since Dieterich's argument in *Hymn. Orph.*, Marburg, 1891.

³ Gruppe ap. Roscher, III. 1150.

⁴ It is, of course, only from this point of view that I am claiming that they have been neglected. They have been dealt with in other respects, e.g. M. Hauck (*de Hymn. Orph. aetate*, Breslau, 1911) has investigated with fair thoroughness their occurrences or non-occurrence in the rest of Greek literature.

worshipper is a little puzzled by the trend of present-day thought, and seeks to escape from his difficulties by such an adjective as *αἰολόμορφος* in this hymn. Let us admit at once that this one epithet is addressed in our hymns to Heaven, Herakles, Zeus, Artemis, the Korybant, Bacchos Lysios Lenaeos, the Charites and the Erinyes, as well as to Athena. Having confessed that, we may add that it is the only one out of twenty-nine (to count only those that are strictly adjectives) which she is made to share with other divinities in such a way as to give the slightest suspicion of incongruity. Even this too might in the case of Athena be defended—that is to say, we might argue that the writer, while sorely tempted (as what Hellenistic or Graeco-Roman writer of hymns would not be?) to apply the word *αἰολόμορφος* to the object of his worship, was yet conscientiously determined only to make use of it if some justification could be found in the traditional mythology with which he might be familiar. For Athena (not altogether without reason, as I hope to show later) is known to him also (v. 10) as *Μῆτις*, and does not the scholiast to Hesiod (*Theog.* 886 ff.) say of *Μῆτις*, λέγεται ὅτι τοιαύτην εἶχε δύναμιν, ὥστε μεταβάλλειν εἰς ὅποιον ἂν ἐβούλετο? In any case we need not have looked further than the *Odyssey* to find plenty of examples of Athena as an expert in the art of metamorphosis.

Again, there is no need to dwell on epithets which in their own nature must be quite general and have never, so far as we know, been particularised in literary or popular thought. In this hymn we have five such. The Homeric *δία, μάκαιρα, πολύλλιστος*, the classical *μεγαλάννυμος*,¹ and *ἀγλαότιμος*, a favourite of the writer of these hymns (12. 8, 18. 17, 34.2, etc.), are all words which a worshipper might use with equal propriety of any god whose power he felt and whom he wished to praise or propitiate. Similarly *λύτεια κακῶν* calls for no explanation, though the writer, whether the same person who wrote Hymn 10 or not, may well have

had in mind the description there of Nature as (v. 17) *αὐξίτροφος, πείρα, πεπαινομένων τε λύτεια*, where the word is used with striking appropriateness and some sense of poetry. Here it is used in a more ordinary way, as the masculine form is in Eur. *El.* 136, *τῶνδε πόνων λυτῆρ* of Zeus. (The feminine seems to be peculiar to these hymns.)

Undoubtedly the impression given by a first reading of the hymn is not that the goddess has lost 'her individuality in a flood of syncretistic appellations. Although there are a few epithets which do not explain themselves at first sight, the majority leave no room for doubt that the associations of the classical Hellenic Athena still dominated the writer's mind. Thus she is first of all the august daughter of Zeus, the warrior-goddess—*πολεμόκλονος*,² *ὄβριμόθυμος, ὀπλοχαρῆς, ὀρμάστειρα, πολεμητόκος*. She is goddess of wisdom, *τεχνῶν μῆτηρ, φρόνησις, εὐρεσίτεχνος*. She is the virgin goddess, *φυγόλεκτρος*. (If some closer verbal parallel is required for this apparently unique word than the customary title *Παρθένος* of the goddess at Athens, we might quote the dedicatory epigram to her as *Διὸς φυγοδέμνιε κύρα*.³) Again, *Γοργοφόνος, Φλεγυραίων ὀλέτειρα γυγάντων*,⁴ *ἱππελάτεια*,⁵ *γλανκῶπος* are obvious epithets for Athena alone.

One or two of these words, although perfectly suitable to describe the Olympian Athena, gain in significance if we think of them as written in the tradition of the theogony attributed to Orpheus and so much used by the neo-Platonists, a supposition which in speaking of other epithets it may be necessary to establish if we are going

² An identical parallel in *Batrachom.* 275.

³ *Anth. P.* 6. 10.

⁴ Which Hauck (*l.c.*, p. 29) regards as compounded from Nonn. *D.* 8. 67 and 48. 43. I am not claiming that these epithets are not commonplaces, and should perhaps apologise for reproducing them. It seemed well, however, to mention them all, as well as those which demand elucidation, in order to emphasise the individual character of the hymn, which is the point at issue. For a classical example of the story see Eur. *Ion* 987-991.

⁵ For Athena associated with horses we have *ἵππια* in Soph. *O.C.* 1070, Pind. *O.* 13. 115, and at Elis according to Paus. 5. 3. 16. 5.

¹ *E.g.* Soph. *Ant.* 148, *ἡ μεγαλάννυμος Νίκη*; Ar. *Thesm.* 315, *Ζεὺς μεγαλάννυμ*, etc.

to give them any significance at all. Thus we notice that Athena is not just the wise, *φρονούσα* or *πολύμητις* or *μητιόεσσα*, but herself *φρόνησις*, *μήτις*. This is in accordance with the tendency of the theogony to think of its gods as less personal, more abstract, powers.¹ In the theogony of Hieronymus and Hellanicus,² Pallas is the wisdom (*σύνεσις*, *φρόνησις*) used by the creator in devising the cosmos. She is here born of the divine *πνεῦμα* called *Μῆτις* mingling with the ether, but ever since Aeschylus it had been getting easier for parent and child gods to be identified.³ In ancient religion this was scarcely an inconsistency, and we need not doubt that the Athena who is called by Proclus *σοφία καὶ νόησις ἐν τῷ δημιουργῷ μένουσα* is the same as the *Μῆτις* who, in the hymn of Syrianus, is included in the list of individuals who circle in the *ἐν δέμας βασιλεῖον* of the *εἰς δαίμων γενέτης*.⁴

This way lies also a possible explanation of *ἀντροδίατος* (v. 3), and with it of one or two other epithets. For *ἀντροδίατος* a much simpler and, I think, more likely explanation suggests itself, but I give this one first for what it is worth. A fusion which might have seemed legitimate to a writer versed in mythology including the theogony of Orpheus is that of Athena and Adrasteia. Adrasteia had two forms: she appears both as the daughter of Zeus⁵ and as his nurse.⁶ Athena, popularly daughter of Zeus, but also in the theogony one of the earlier cosmic figures (v. previous paragraph), is again *ἡγεμὼν τῶν Κουρήτων*, *ὡς φησὶν Ὀρφεύς*,⁷ and presumably therefore assisted at the din which was necessary to save the life of the infant Zeus. It is Adrasteia's business, as she stands at the entrance to the cave

of Night, *ἡχεῖν · παλάμῃσι δὲ χάλκεα ῥόπτρα δάκεν Ἀδραστεία · ἐν τοῖς προθύροις γὰρ τοῦ ἀντροῦ τῆς Νυκτὸς ἡχεῖν λέγεται τοῖς κυμβάλοις*.⁸ As a nurse of Zeus, too, she tended him *ἀντρῷ ἐν Ἰδαίῳ*.⁹ If, then, we may believe that Athena was associated with Adrasteia, she may fairly claim the right to a connexion with caves.

This association might also throw a direct light, without opening up at present the whole question of bisexual deities, on the use here of *ἄρσση καὶ θῆλυς* (v. 10), in view of the theogony of Kern O.F. 54: *ἀρρενόθηλυν αὐτὴν* (sc. τὴν Ἀδράστεϊαν) *ὑπεστήσατο πρὸς ἐνδείξιν τῆς πάντων γεννητικῆς αἰτίας*. Here again we have no more than an example of a characteristic belonging quite naturally to the Athena of orthodox anthropomorphic mythology, although gaining in possible significance and aptness of expression if looked at in the light of the theogonies quoted by later philosophic writers as Orphic; for Athena was always *κάρτα τοῦ πατρός*, and Cornutus (ch. 20) explains one of his etymologies *διὰ τὸ καίπερ θήλειαν οὖσαν ἤκιστα τῆς θηλότητος καὶ ἐκλύσεως μετέχειν τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν*.

For the likelihood of Athena having two forms, as she must have had in the Orphic theogony mentioned above and also if our association of her with Adrasteia (nurse and daughter) is to hold water, we might bring forward *ἄρρητη, ῥήτη* in v. 3. Similar antitheses are common,¹⁰ but not therefore meaningless, and this one has a special meaning in that in one of the Orphic theogonies *ἄρρητος* denotes the primeval, incomprehensible principle from which the universe and the gods are descended. Before water or earth, the two *πρῶται ἀρχαί*, there was a single *ἀρχή* which was *ἄρρητον*,¹¹ and Athena in her older form of pre-cosmic *σύνεσις*, the adviser of the Demiurge, seems well to deserve the same title.

The other suggestion for the meaning

¹ Whether this again is because the authors of the theogony were of Stoic persuasion (i.e. what are the sources of what we are here suggesting as sources) does not immediately concern us now.

² Apion ap. Clem. Roman. *Homil.* 6. 5. 12 (Kern, *Orph. Fr.*, 133).

³ Cp. *Eum.* 2, 3 with P.V. 211, 2.

⁴ Kern, O.F. 175, 169.

⁵ Eur. *Rhes.* 342.

⁶ Ap. Rhod. 3. 133; Procl. *Tim.* 418 (= Kern, O.F. 162).

⁷ Procl. *Crat.* 406d (Kern, O.F. 185).

⁸ Herm. Plat. *Phaedr.* 248c (Kern, O.F. 105).

⁹ Ap. Rhod. 3. 133; Procl. *Tim.* 41e (Kern, O.F. 162).

¹⁰ E.g. Corp. Herm. 5. 10a and the hymn of Synesius quoted by Kern, O.F. 206.

¹¹ Damasc. *de Princ.* 1. 123 bis (= Kern, O.F. 54).

of ἀντροδίατος which I am more inclined to, believing as I do that we are dealing in these hymns with a genuine living cult, is that it is simply local. The Athena to whom this hymn was addressed was worshipped in a cave, which was considered to be her especial abode. I can cite one exact parallel. While travelling in Asia Minor I heard of the existence of the Παράγια Σπηλιάνη in Samos, and although it would be extremely rash to suggest without further knowledge that she was a descendant in unbroken line from an Ἀθηνᾶ ἀντροδίατος, it is yet striking to meet a living Madonna of the Cave, and suggests the likelihood that the virgin goddess has at some other time been worshipped, either here or elsewhere, with the same title.

This makes a convenient transition to another set of epithets or descriptive clauses. The Phrygian Mother-Goddess was, as Hugo Gressmann pointed out,¹ a dweller not only on mountains, but also, and even earlier, *in* mountains. She was the earth itself,² rich mother of fruits and precious metals, and as such was thought of as having her seat in holes and caverns, which were accordingly held sacred to her. Immediately following on ἀντροδίατος we have these two lines:

ἡ κατέχεις ὄχθων ὑψηλὰς ἀκρωπέλας
ἥδ' ἔρεα σκιδέντα, νάπησ' τε σὴν φρένα τέρπεις.]

This is suggestive not so much of Athena as of the Phrygian Mother, the goddess who roamed the heights of Ida, and whose worshippers must follow

Ubi cerva silvicultrix, ubi aper nemorivagus.

So is φίλοιστρε (v. 9), which occurs again in the hymn to the Mother herself,³ and suggests the prayer with which Catullus ends his poem:

Procul a mea tuus sit furor omnis, era, domo:
Alios age incitatos, alios age rabidos.

¹ *Die Orientalischen Religionen*, pp. 59 ff. (The double significance of the German 'Berg' helps out his meaning here.) He mentions in particular the monuments at Arslankaya and Aezani.

² The identity of the deities addressed in hymns 26 and 27 should be obvious, if some immediate confirmation of this is necessary.

³ 27. 13. It is applied to one other deity, Artemis (36. 5), where it stands next to κυνήγετι, which gives it special meaning.

Now it is well known that in Central Anatolia the merest veneer of Greek religion disguised the native cults in Greco-Roman times.⁴ The Great Mother lived on although she might be given a Hellenic name, and it is further known that at Iconium this name was Athena. I quote from Ramsay: 'The Iconian Athena may be regarded as a Hellenised form of the Phrygian goddess, for a Latin inscription is dedicated to Minerva Zizimene. . . . The immigrant Greek element made the native goddess their own and gave her a Greek form; but the common people never lost their hold on their own Mother-Goddess.'⁵ Otto Kern has already argued persuasively in favour of an Anatolian origin for the hymns. It may be that in these two lines and in the epithet ἀντροδίατος we are finding further evidence in his support.⁶ It is tempting to mention, though too much store should not be set by it, that Ramsay in the same passage comments on the Iconian Athena's attribute of a snake (figured on coins of the city), thus making us think again of Iconium when we come to the epithet δράκαινα in v. 11. The snake was, with the owl, a regular companion of the goddess as represented in art, but was much known of the reasons for its presence? Cornutus (*l.c.*) can do no better than take it together with the owl and refer it weakly to the commonest Homeric epithet of Athena: οἱ δὲ δράκοντες καὶ ἡ γλαῦξ διὰ το ἔμφερές τῶν ὀμμάτων ἀνατίθενται ταύτῃ γλαυκώπιδι οὔσῃ. σμερδαλέον γὰρ ὁ δράκων δέδορκε κτλ. It must, one would think, be a relic of a chthonian aspect of the deity, and be

⁴ See especially Calder in *C.R.* XXIV., pp. 77-79.

⁵ *Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 332, 333.

⁶ *Geneth. für Robert*, pp. 89 ff. It is interesting as showing the fruitfulness of this method of approach to the hymns (namely, through the study of Anatolian religion from epigraphical and numismatic, *i.e.* non-literary, sources), to recollect that three deities (Μίση, Ἰπτα, and Μειλιτώ) quoted by Petersen (*l.c.*, p. 413) as proof that the writer had access to lost Orphic literature because they are otherwise unknown, are all presented to us by Kern as having since turned up (the last as an epithet of Hecate) on inscriptions from Asia Minor's 'unerschöpflichem Boden.'

most prominent when that aspect was to the fore. Even though Athena was generally represented accompanied by a serpent and wearing the Gorgoneion, it is extremely doubtful whether she has been addressed elsewhere herself by the simple title *δράκαινα*, and yet this suits very well with the Phrygian earth-goddess whose place she took at Iconium.

One more epithet remains, and this confirms our present line of argument. There is apparently¹ no other literary reference to Athena as *νικηφόρος* (v. 3), but *Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιὰς Νικηφόρος* was the patron deity of Pergamum, as we know from the results of the excavations there.² We know, too, that the worship of the goddess with this title was not confined to that city, but was adopted by cities once under the rule of Pergamum, as Sterrett remarks in a note to an inscription found by him at Uluborlu (Apollonia in Galatia)

mentioning a priest of the cult.³ If we may judge by the influence once exercised by the Pergamene Kingdom, the epithet should have been pretty widely known in Asia Minor.

To sum up, it seems likely, as far as one may generalise from a brief investigation of a very small part of the field, that further study of the epithets in this collection of hymns would lead (a) to the revealing of further evidence for the country in which the hymns arose, (b) to the disclosure of points of contact with the rest of the so-called Orphic literature. The results should be worth having, for they can hardly fail to throw some light on ancient religious belief, though I should be the first to admit that they may leave us as far as we were before (which is far indeed) from discovering whether there was ever a man, Greek or Roman, who could stand up and say 'Orphicus sum,' and what he would mean if he did.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

*Peterhouse,
Cambridge.*

¹ Besides my own impression, I rely on Bruchmann, *Epith. Deorum*, Suppl. to Roscher's *Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1891).

² Published in *Jahrb. der Preuss. Kunstsamm.*, Vol. III, and elsewhere.

³ Sterrett, *Pap. Amer. Sch.*, Vol. III. No. 532.

THE GAP IN THE PRO FLACCO.

CICERO'S *Pro Flacco* has a large gap between §§ 4 and 6, and the question may be asked, What have we towards filling it, and how long is it? One bridge across the gap we have in the Scholiast, who commented on a complete text. The first preserved note of the Scholiast is on 2. 12 (references are to the small section and line of the Oxford text), where the lemma must have been *si forte . . . exstittisset*. From here he goes through to the end of the speech, except for the loss of four pages of commentary after the lemma *Di . . . Lentulum*, two pages after 9. 19 *non quo . . . derogem*, four pages after 21. 6 *Triduo . . . iubet*, eight pages after 53. 19 *si hunc . . . doloris sui*. From 4. 25 to 6. 23, i.e. from the last convenient lemma before to the first lemma after the gap, are nine pages of Scholiast. Can we find out how many lines of the Oxford text the Scholiast is likely to comment on in this space? If

we count the pages of commentary for which we can say definitely that they cover so many lines of text, and also the lines of text which they cover, we arrive at 38 pages of commentary to 1164 lines of text, or about 30 lines to the page of commentary, so that nine pages would come to 270 lines. This is, of course, only an average. The blocks of nine pages which we can check over respectively 190, 263, 282, and 365 lines. But if we take 270 lines and subtract 19 for 4. 25—5. 14 and 9 for 6. 14—23, we get 242 lines for the gap. This is, of course, an extremely rough calculation, and is only useful as showing us the sort of length which the gap must be. The only MS. we have for the gap is the *Fragmentum Mediolanense*; this is a single leaf of manuscript, written in three columns, with 11 letters to the line and 24 lines to the page. If allowance is made for the

mutilated lines, this leaf contains 34 lines of Oxford text. A quaternion of this manuscript would contain 272 lines, or about 10 pages of Oxford text. This is, it is true, 28 lines more than the number at which we arrived, but still a perfectly possible amount for the Scholiast to comment upon.

The text of the Scholiast was very like the text of V. 41. 14 om. *fici*, 41. 17 *emisso*, 41. 1 *crimine*, 43. 15 *est bona et*, 45. 2 *postea nemo*, 46. 10 *Nerati*, are readings which are common, where not peculiar, to both. Then consider his larger omissions: 14. 6 *vehementer*, 10 letters; 17. 22 *Mithridates . . . tenebat*, 63 letters; 20. 23 *et . . . referre*, 39 letters; 21. 7 *iudicium . . . obsignari*, 22 letters; 47. 18 *enim . . . iste*, 13 letters; 92. 26 *propositum . . . Nam*, 64 letters. These all look as if his text had a line of 10-13 letters. This agrees with the evidence of the other passages: 43. 12 *furti et pro socio damna . . . tus est. Nam princeps legationis Lysanias*, after *pro* his eye slipped back a line and he inserted *furti*, and after *Nam* he skipped two lines; 51. 18 *Eum tu testem*; after *Eum* his eye skipped to the beginning of the next line; 52. 4 *publicam commisisse homini egenti sordido*, he missed *commisisse*, skipped from *egenti* to *sordido*, then inserted *commisisse*. From this evidence, then, it looks as if the Scholiast had used an ancestor of V which was then complete and had a line of 9-13 letters: V itself seems to have gone back to an ancestor which had an 11-letter line (see Clark, *Descent of Manuscripts*, p. 298): the *Fragmentum Mediolanense* has also an 11-letter line. So it looks as if the *Fragmentum*, the Scholiast, and V are in the same MS. tradition.

There is, however, another means of approach. V contains §§ 39-54 (for details, see Clark, *op. cit.* p. 283) of our speech, but with the heading *Pro Fonteio*; after this comes *Pro Fonteio* 11-49, and after this the *Philippics*; the deduction is that the *Pro Fonteio* and *Pro Flacco* had got mixed up in an ancestor. Before the fragments of the *Pro Flacco* are lost 32 folios, of which 6 are needed for the end of the *In Pisonem*, and the remaining 26, about 1,742 lines of Oxford text, presumably contained the rest of the *Pro Fonteio*

and *Pro Flacco*. Here we call in the evidence of the Cusan fragments;¹ the readings of these show the closest possible agreement with V. They are excerpts, and are in the following order: (i.) Nine unknown fragments of the *Pro Fonteio*, and one known from the Vatican palimpsest, i.e. ten fragments from the beginning of the *Pro Fonteio*; (ii.) eight unknown fragments headed *Pro Fonteio*, but rightly attributed to the *Pro Flacco* owing to their incompatibility with the other speech by Traube (*Abh. Bay. Akad.*, XIX.)—they will be shown later to belong to the last two or three pages of the big gap; (iii.) eight fragments of the *Pro Flacco* from §§ 8 to 48; (iv.) fragments from *Pro Fonteio* 11-49; (v.) fragments of the *Philippics*. Thus the order is the same as in V, only it gives us this important addition, that before *Pro Flacco* 39 came (i.) *Pro Fonteio* 1-10; (ii.) *Pro Flacco* 1-39.

How did this confusion occur, if we assume that the ancestor of both V and the manuscript used by the Cusan excerptor (which was probably not V itself: see Traube, *op. cit.*) had both speeches complete? The simplest way would be for *Pro Flacco* 1-54 to have formed a block of folios which changed places with an equal block of folios that originally followed it and contained the rest of the *Pro Flacco* and the beginning of the *Pro Fonteio*. The amount of these two blocks we know: it is the gap in V and *Pro Flacco* 39-54, that is 1,952 lines, or, if our theory is right, two blocks of 976 lines; one of these blocks contained *Pro Flacco* 54-end, that is 612 lines, and the beginning of the *Pro Fonteio*, which will have been 364 lines, the other contained *Pro Flacco* 1-54, as we have it, which amounts to 706 lines, and the gap, which therefore works out at 270 lines. This corresponds nearly enough to the figure 272 at which we arrived by the other method.

The gap then comprises some ten pages of the Oxford text or rather less. How was it filled? I acknowledge here my great debt to Schöll's article in

¹ Klein, *Ueber eine Handschrift des Nicolaus von Cues*.

Rh. Mus. 1896, p. 381, though I do not accept all his conclusions. The best guide to the filling of the gap is given by the great peroration, § 95 ff.: 'Antonius has been sacrificed to Catiline, Flaccus is to be sacrificed to Lentulus, we are being named by informers, although it was the very senators and equites who will be our jurors who joined us then. How unfair that I who saved Rome from Lentulus should have to defend Piso, Murena and Thermus!' This takes us as far as the first batch of Scholiast fragments. The trial of Antonius and Flaccus, and the apprehended trial of Cicero, have been already mentioned before the gap. In the first three fragments he seems to accuse the prosecution of trying to show his glorious deeds in a lurid light; in the fourth he returns to the responsibility of the senate; in the fifth he introduces Lentulus perhaps in the same context, certainly with the same *O di immortales*, as in 97. Then to return to the peroration: § 100, 'If you are more interested in the provinces, we set against Asia first a great part of Asia, Gaul, Cilicia, Spain, Crete, the best of the Greeks, Servilius, and Metellus, Flaccus' city praetorship and his whole life!' Some such transition must also have been effected in the gap. Perhaps it went like this: 'All these glorious deeds of 63 you pass over, Laelius, and concentrate on the false evidence you have gained from Asiatics who were governed by him: this would only be valid if this foreign specimen (*exemplum externum*) agreed with his domestic life. But I refuse to allow you to abstract a year of a man's life and build your case on that.' This is the beginning of the *Fragmentum Mediolanense*, which is probably the second page of the eight which have dropped out, for there is, as far as I can see, no cogent argument advanced by Schöll for putting it later. In it Cicero says he is going to discuss Flaccus' youth, his private life, his life in the provinces (the list is the same as in 100, if we follow Schöll in putting *Hispaniae* third), and only then the testimony of provincials, and he starts at the end with his youth.

Then let us consider the end of the gap. First he gets on to the subject of

witnesses (§ 6 onwards), with at the beginning a cursory note on his jurisdiction as *praetor urbanus*, which was one of the heads of the peroration not mentioned in the *Fragmentum Mediolanense*. Secondly the Scholiast to 6. 23 says *priusquam adgrediatur orator destruere personam Graccorum . . . opponit praecedentium magistratum*; the witnesses to these are Flaccus his father and Flaccus his uncle, Servilius, Piso, and Metellus, who are in fact the favourable witnesses, which is the other head in the peroration not considered in the *Fragmentum Mediolanense*. The Scholiast on the lemma *Sed si neque . . .* says *gradus honorum cum quadam testificatione cognitae simul et probatae integritatis extollat*; this, taken in conjunction with the note quoted above and with the introduction of the next lemma by *sequenti capite*, of the next by *et statim subicit*, shows that the Scholiast regarded the passage from *sed si neque* to *At a testibus laeditur* as a compact and presumably not very lengthy section. One more detail: to the lemma *Idem novum . . .* he says *cognomentum ex virtute, ut supra diximus, Cretici meruit*; this must refer to a previous note, which must have been in the description of Flaccus' conduct in Crete foreshadowed by the *Fragmentum Mediolanense*.

Now the *Fragmenta Cusana*: no. 18 must refer to Piso, and could be joined directly to the lemma of the Scholiast; no. 17 refers to the people of Sipylus, and might have formed the lemma to the note of the Scholiast preserved immediately after his four lost pages. With this no. 16, which repeats the sentiment of §§ 25-6 and 98, might have been connected by such a link as *quod quidem eo minus L. Flaccus necesse habet, quod optimorum virorum testimoniis nititur*. Nos. 14, 15, 16 read straight off, if we emend in 14 to *defendo*. Nos. 12 and 13 closely precede these. No. 11, with which Schöll rightly associates the two fragments preserved in other authorities, shows us how this section was introduced. After the discussion of Flaccus' youth and services introduced by the *Fragmentum Mediolanense*, he adduced a single Asiatic witness, as he often does, e.g. Athenagoras in § 17;

he then says how absurd it is to listen, when we know of Flaccus' military prowess to which the loyal city of Sipylus gives such eloquent testimony (and Sipylus is part at least of the *pars magna eiusdem provinciae*). He then passes on to the new section, which we have already discussed—Flaccus' commanders as evidence of his virtues.

There are 21 lines of *Fragmenta Cusana* and 7 of Scholiast's lemmata, so this whole section need not take more than two leaves of the manuscript. This leaves four in the middle for the exposition of Flaccus' youth and military services.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

CICERO AND THE LEX GABINIA.

To attempt to defend Cicero against the attacks of Mommsen and his followers may seem at this time to be a waste of labour, but there is one count in the indictment which Cicero's defenders have up to now allowed to go by default, and it is my belief that such evidence as we have upon the point tells rather in Cicero's favour than against him.

In his denunciation of Cicero, Mommsen writes: 'When he exhibited the appearance of action, the questions to which his action applied had as a rule just reached their solution . . . thus he was silent at the discussion on the Gabinian, and acted as a champion of the Manilian, law' (*History of Rome*, Bk. V., Ch. xii.). It is true that we have no definite evidence that Cicero supported the Gabinian law, but there are three passages in his own writings which seem to me to have some bearing on the question.

(1) Writing to Atticus in May 67 (the date is that given by Tyrrell and Purser, Vol. I., ed. 3, p. 138), Cicero says: 'Hoc communibus amicis qui te expectant praedico, te non modo non arcessi a me sed prohiberi, quod intellegam multo magis interesse tua te agere quod agendum est hoc tempore quam mea te adesse comitiis' (*Ad Att.* I. 10. 6). Comparison of this passage with *Ad Att.* I. 2. 2 (written about the middle of 65 B.C.) shows that Cicero had no such misgivings about the result of the praetorian elections for 66 as he had about that of the consular elections for 63.

(2) In a second letter, dated by Tyrrell and Purser (I., ed. 3, p. 139) to July or August 67, Cicero writes: 'In epistula tua scriptum erat, me iam

arbitrari designatum esse' (*Ad Att.* I. 11. 2); which shows that Cicero's confidence was shared by his friend.

(3) At the opening of the speech *Pro lege Manilia*, Cicero says, 'propter dilationem comitiorum ter praetor primus cunctis centuriis renuntiatus sum' (I. 2), thus proving how well-founded his confidence was.

What was the reason for this success? For a *novus homo* to head the poll *μετιόντων ἄμα σὺν αὐτῷ πολλῶν καὶ γενναίων* (Plutarch, *Cic.* 9) was unusual: to head it three times, unprecedented. The prosecution of Verres had secured for Cicero the leadership of the Roman bar, but that kind of reputation was no passport to electoral triumphs. His curule aedileship in 69 can hardly have been so magnificent as to ensure such enormous popularity two years later. Bribery on the scale necessary would have required the means of a Crassus, and in any case we know that Cicero never bribed. I suggest that Cicero owed his success to the fact that he had supported the proposals of Gabinus from the very beginning (it is significant that in May 67 he had already told Atticus that there was no need for him to return), and that he reaped the reward of one who had risked his political future by defying the Senate in the cause of a popular favourite.

This suggestion has the further advantage that it gives a proper perspective to a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* which reads like a serious exaggeration on the theory that Cicero's support of Pompey was only the submission of a trimmer to the *fait accompli*. Immediately before recording Cicero's election to the praetorship (a position which to my mind gives the passage

especial significance), Plutarch writes: Πομπήιος δὲ καὶ Κικέρωνα ἐθεράπευε, καὶ μέγα πρὸς δύναμιν αὐτῷ καὶ δόξαν ἡ Κικέρωνος συνέπραξε πολιτεία (Cic. 8). Surely the use of μέγα can only be justified if Cicero supported the proposal of Gabinus from the first.

I do not suppose that Cicero's support took the form of public speeches. The opening paragraph of the speech *Pro lege Manilia* tells us that he had never before spoken from the *rostra*—the place from which *contiones* were usually addressed—and also supplies the reason for this, that, till his election had established his position, his devotion to a life of advocacy had not provided him with sufficient *auctoritas* for him to obtain a *contio* from any magistrate. His support of Gabinus must have taken the form of votes and perhaps speeches in the Senate, 'cum is (i.e. A. Gabinus) de uno imperatore contra praedones constituendo legem promulgasset' (*Pro lege Man.* 17, 52).

But the main objection to this suggestion is contained in the absence of any references to Cicero's support of the proposal in the speech on the Manilian law, and especially in the sentence 'mea quidem sententia, Quirites, unus A. Gabinus belli maritimi rerumque gestarum Cn. Pompeii socius ascri-

bitur, propterea quod . . . uni illud bellum suscipiendum vestris suffragiis detulit' (*op. cit.* 19, 58). All, I think, that this sentence necessarily means is that the active work of carrying through the proposal was done by Gabinus: it need not exclude the possibility that Cicero supported him in less active ways. The more general objection may, I think, be answered on the ground that Cicero is posing in this speech as the man with little experience of politics, who brings to the study of the crisis a mind trained in the law-courts, and sees only one possible course open to the state—he speaks of his qualifications as 'ad agendum facultatis tantum quantum homini vigilanti ex forensi usu prope quotidiana dicendi exercitatio potuit afferre' (*Pro lege Man.* 1)—and this pose of impartiality would be spoiled by any direct reference to his attitude in the previous year. All that he needs to do is to remind his hearers of it by a covert hint, and that hint can, I think, be found in his reference to his electoral triumph.

In conclusion, I wish to express my thanks to Dr. M. Cary for criticisms and advice, which have been of material assistance to me in developing this theory.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

NUGAE ELEGIACAE.

TIBULLUS I. VII.:

57 nec taceat monumenta uiae quem Tuscula
tellus
candidaque antiquo detinet Alba lare;
namque opibus congesta tuis hic glarea
dura
sternitur, hic apta iungitur arte silex;
te canit agricola magna cum uenerit urbe
62 serus inoffensum rettuleritque pedem.

LINE 57 links on very awkwardly with the preceding couplet, a wish that Messalla may have a family to cheer him in old age; and 57 f. seem to describe a dweller in Rome who has occasion to use the newly paved road when coming home from the country, in contrast with (61 f.) the rustic returning to the country from the city: but, if so, we are forced to understand (58) *detinet*, etc., as 'keeps (from reach-

ing home) by means of its ancient abode,' surely an odd phrase; also 59 f. come between the two travellers awkwardly—the pavement is a boon to both of them. I propose to put 61 f. before 57, altering *canit* to *canat* to go with the eight other subjunctives that will then surround it. Both couplets, 61 f. and 57 f., will now refer to the same rustic, and *detinet* will mean that he still lives in his old home in Tusculum or at Alba. In 61 editors conjecture *agricola* <a> and *agricola* <e>: the former gives a more obvious haplography.

Id. II. VI. 39 F.:

qualis ab excelsa praeceps delapsa fenestra
uenit ad infernos sanguinolenta lacus.

Macer's poor sister, who fell out of a window straight into the lakes of the lower world, always reminds me of Koronis, who went down to Hades in her bedroom, *eis 'Aída dōmon en thaláμφ katéβα*, Pindar, *Pyth.* III. 11.

OVID, *AMORES* III. VI. 39 FF.:

Nilus . . .
fertur in Euanthe collectam Asopide flammam
uincere gurgitibus non potuisse suis.

This is an even more remarkable blend of the literal and the metaphorical than Tibullus II. vi. above. It did not escape the keen eye of that excellent classical scholar W. S. Gilbert, who

thought it too good to waste, and so wrote in *Iolanthe*:

O Captain Shaw,
Type of a fire kept under,
Could thy brigade
With cold cascade
Quench my poor heart? I wonder!

And in the chorus of the next verse he gave a neat hint of acknowledgment:

O gentle dove,
Type of Ovidius Naso!

But enough of these toys.

H. RACKHAM.

*Christ's College,
Cambridge.*

CHERSONESUS TAURICA.

STRABO, VII. iv. 2, describes the city Chersonesus Taurica and its lesser peninsula (see Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 496). One of the difficulties of this passage, about the Cape Parthenium, the three harbours between it and the city, *εἰθ' ἡ παλαιὰ Χερρόνησος κατεσκαμμένη*, seems to have been cleared up. Professor K. E. Grinevich saw remains under water immediately to the west of the Cape and its lighthouse and obtained the services of

divers, who discovered a paved agora, a round storehouse, streets intersecting at right angles, and sixteen towers along a curtain wall. Only the southern part of the town has yet been explored. It would appear that the harbour lay to the south of it. The character of the masonry in the towers and their size make them very similar to the fourth-century towers of New Chersonesus.

E. H. MINNS.

Pembroke College, Cambridge.

REVIEWS

THE ANCIENT EXPLORERS.

The Ancient Explorers. By M. CARY, D.Litt., and E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. Pp. 270; 15 maps. London: Methuen, 1929. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

IT is as well to be frank in recording impressions of a work such as this: 'il est beau d'écrire ce qu'on pense; c'est le privilège de l'homme': to the present writer, at any rate, the reading of this book has been a source of unalloyed pleasure. It is scholarly, for the authors know their ancient texts well, are not afraid of propounding new interpretations, and discuss and combat the views of commentators both ancient and modern. It is full and complete: here are all the splendid stories of search and adventure throughout antiquity—Hanno the Carthaginian coasting down Africa, Pytheas' voyage northward and his marvellous tales that Strabo sneered at, Diogenes and the Mountains of the

Moon, Alexander's marches, the agents of Maes Titianus journeying eastwards along the silk-routes, the return of the Ten Thousand, and many others; here are contained all the journeys of exploration that were made in ancient times, and many that were not, for the book concludes with a delightful chapter on 'Imaginary Discoveries,' in which the Hyperboreans and Atlantis are put to rest. Is it necessary to add that there is a good index, and fifteen maps, some in the text, some to pull out? The narrative is lucid, the documentation (at the back of the book) ample. And it certainly supplies a need. For many years past a great deal of writing upon these explorers, for example Pytheas, has lain buried in obscure German or French pamphlets, or in periodicals with strange titles to which a Classical student could not easily find access:

now all this scattered material has been carefully collected, sifted and criticised, and the results made available in convenient form. This does not necessarily mean that the present reviewer is prepared to subscribe loyally to all the theories expressed, but it does mean that the reader is never left in doubt as to the grounds or evidence upon which the authors have based their conclusions; it is all put before him.

One or two slight cavillings may find utterance here. Very few voyages have been missed out, but as things Egyptian are included some reference might have been made to the fatuous Wen-Amon and his misfortunes: also, in Roman times, the extraordinary exploit of the mutinous Usipi (Tacitus, *Agric.* 28) deserves mention, more especially as Dio Cassius suggests (LXVI. 20) that it gave the impulse for the Roman circumnavigation of Britain. On the date of Hippalus I still find it hard to come to agreement with Mr. Warmington, and in connection with the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* it would have been as well to refer to the excellent new text and studies provided by Hjalmar Frisk in *Le Périphe de la mer Erythrée*, pub-

lished at Gothenburg in 1927. On finds of Roman coins north of the Rhine and Danube there has recently been published an extremely complete survey, with some very suggestive analyses, by Sture Bolin, *Fyndnen av romerska mynt i det fria Germanien*, at Lund in 1926, and both this pamphlet and also E. Jungklaus' *Römische Funde in Pommern* (Greifswald, 1924) might have been quoted in the notes to Chapter VI. On p. 245 some reference should be given, *à propos* of Alexander and Dionysus, to Nock's important article in *J.H.S.* XLVIII., pp. 21 ff. The one or two misprints noted are quite unimportant, and no one is likely to be seriously misled by the island Ischia which appears on Map I.

But these remarks are merely meant as suggestions, and they certainly are not designed to detract from the merit of a notable performance. The book is easy to read, it is full of interest, and it is published at a price which puts it within the reach of all.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*St. John's College,
Cambridge.*

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN GREECE.

The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle. By R. J. BONNER and GERTRUDE SMITH. Pp. viii + 390. University of Chicago, 1930. 18s.

THIS volume sums up and rounds off a series of valuable articles on Greek law made independently by the present joint authors. Though it does not pretend to treat its subject exhaustively, it traces the main lines of development in Greek jurisdiction from Homer and Hesiod through the archaic law codes to Solonian and Demosthenic Athens, and it deals fully with the general political conditions out of which each system of jurisdiction arose. It is an authoritative piece of work, and it will repay consultation by constitutional historians as well as by jurists.

The chapter on the Heroic Age gives a clear and satisfactory account of the manner in which state tribunals first cut into the custom of private self-

help. Though the authors allow for the dread of pollution as a factor in establishing courts for homicide, they concur in the main with Professor Calhoun in finding the origin of criminal jurisdiction, not in a religious motive, but in the community's desire and growing capacity for self-help. They do not discuss the traces of trial by ordeal in early Greece, but they give a good description of the first methods of taking oral evidence, and they offer an attractive explanation of the famous lawsuit in *Iliad* XVIII as a case of trial by wager.

The chapters on Draco and Solon are necessarily taken up with many small points of controversy. Their main result is further to establish the view that the Ephetae were a committee of the Areopagus, and that the Heliaea was originally a court of appeal. In the long and important chapter on Cleisthenes

the authors trace the growth of the Heliaea into a criminal court of first instance and define its relations with the Boule. They also attribute to Cleisthenes the division of the Heliaea into dicasteries. But the need to decongest this body scarcely arose until Athens had become an important mercantile state, which did not happen till after 480 B.C. Furthermore, the statement of Aristotle that Ephialtes handed over part of the duties of the Areopagus to the dicasteries does not necessarily prove the previous existence of these courts; they might have been instituted *ad hoc*. There still remains much to be said for Grote's view that the provision of pay for dicasts followed close upon the creation of the dicastic courts, and that both were Periclean measures.

The authors make Pericles responsible for a second movement against the Areopagus in 451-0. But it is unlikely that Pericles should have reserved his attack during the ten years of Cimon's absence in order to launch it just after his return. The evidence for Pericles' second campaign comes from Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* chs. 26-27), who gives details of democratic legislation in the fifties, and then proceeds: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ δημαγωγεῖν ἐλθόντος Περικλέους . . . τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔνια παρείλετο. But the introductory μετὰ ταῦτα cannot be pressed here, for

Pericles certainly did not begin his demagogic career in 451-0.

The authors go on to define the residual powers exercised by the Areopagus under the full democracy, and the effects upon the judiciary of the revolutions and counter-revolutions at the end of the fifth century. Here they clear up a good many obscure points, particularly in connexion with the institution of εἰσαγγελία.

The last chapter passes under review the judicial arrangements at Athens in the fourth century. It deals at some length with the διαίτηται, the archons' ἀνάκρισις, and the successive reorganisations of the dicasteries. Some readers would no doubt have liked this chapter to end with a judicial pronouncement on the merits and demerits of the dicastic system. A statement of this kind is still a desideratum, and the authors of the present volume are clearly well qualified to make it. Perhaps they will include it in a second volume on Greek law which they have promised.

Two small points for animadversion. On p. 223 the revolt of Thasos is twice dated to 470-69. Is Naxos meant here? References for Attic inscriptions are given to the obsolete *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum* I, II and IV, not to the revised edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae*.

M. CARY.

University College,
London.

TWO THEOCRITUS PAPYRI.

Two Theocritus Papyri. Edited by A. S. HUNT, D.Litt., and JOHN JOHNSON, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. Pp. iv + 92; two facsimiles. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1930. 42s.

THIS volume contains the large Theocritean papyrus of about 500 A.D., found by Dr. Johnson at Antinoë in 1913-14, and a late-second-century papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, found eight years earlier and withheld from the 1927 volume of P. Oxy. in order to keep P. Ant. company. It will take time to digest the importance of these finds, and what I say of them here must be taken as a first impression only.

P. Oxy. 2064 contains *Idd.* 1, 6, 4, 5,

7, 3, 8, in that order. It is extremely scrappy, preserving nowhere a complete line and seldom as much as half a line. It has few novelties, and of those most are patently false. 5. 144 ἀμνάν deserves, as the editor says, consideration, but I do not think it deserves very much; 7. 75 φύοντο may be right, but was already known from P. Oxy. 1618. In *Idd.* 8 its text at 13 was not that of our MSS., and may be thought to lend a qualified support to Legrand's καὶ τί νυ; at 74 it has λόγον (rightly, as I think); it presents 57-60 in the place from which Hermann and Wilamowitz arbitrarily and unreasonably expel them, but since it also presents that precious line 77 in

the place to which it can hardly belong, the value of its evidence is little. In short the effect of P. Oxy. 2064 on our texts will be small.

P. Ant. is three fragmentary quires of a codex and contains *Idd.* 1, 5, [? 7] . . . 10, 14, 13, 12, 2, 18, 15, 26, 24, 17 . . . the Aeolic poems, 22. The first and third quires are scrappy, but of the second the remains are substantial, and from 12. 22 to 26. 13 the text is fairly solid. Its most startling feature by a long way is that it included some thirty new lines beyond the present end of 24, and also a fourth Aeolic poem. It must be accounted extremely bad luck that in neither of these places more than a word here and there survives, as also that the text of 29 and 30, where help is badly needed, should be in a similar state.

The text distributes its favours with some impartiality among our MSS., but its agreements with inferior authorities in generally rejected readings do not in the main seem very important. The papyrus is carelessly written, and neither scribe nor diorthotes was a scholar. Apart, however, from mere blunders, it presents a considerable number of novelties which will require leisurely consideration. A preliminary survey of them suggests that the following are the most notable: 14. 23 κήφλέγεται, 26 καταφρύγετο, 24. 72 τὰν δ' Εὐνείτας τοιῷδ' ἀπαμείβετο μύθῳ, 94 φέρεσθαι. To these we may add 2. 3, 10, 159 καταδήσομαι, 82 πυρί, 14. 13 ἄγεις, 15. 7 αἰέν, 25 εἵπαις ἄν, 98 πέρυσι (of which P. Oxy. 1618 gave the last three letters), 30. 4 and 5 transposed, supporting conjectures which have been variously received; and 18. 25 οὐδ' ἄτις supporting one in which not even its author believed. It will be observed that, with the exception of 15. 7 and 18. 25, none of these passages are of notorious difficulty, and at the cruces, for one reason or another, the papyrus is disappointing. 2. 60, 12. 23, 15. 30, 38,¹ 126 ff. remain in the same, or substantially the

same, position as before; 1. 51 is the first line of a lacuna; at 14. 60, 17. 2, 18. 5, 26. 27 ff., 30. 4 there are gaps at critical points, though it is something to know that 14. 60 ended]τοισιν ἄριστος; and there are some novelties at 26. 27 ff. At 2. 24 κακκ. υρισσα is new but ambiguous; at 15. 119 βρίθουσαι (with one MS.) is a simple solution of a difficulty, and so is ἀεργοί at 50. It may, however, be thought that they are too simple, for there are things in the papyrus which weaken one's trust in its integrity; for instance, 2. 62 καὶ λέγ' ἐπιτρύζουσα τὰ Δελφίδος ὅστιά καίω, 15. 99 διαχρέμπεται, 112 καλεῖται, 24. 129 Ἀργόθεν, 26. 13 ἱερά.

In matters of dialect the papyrus is as inconsistent as the MSS., but δρίφον at 15. 2 looks right by reason of Sophron fr. 10; and if Sophron fr. 5 again tempts an editor to introduce πεῖ to Theocritus, he now has the support of P. Ant. at 15. 33 and probably at 2. 19.

Both papyri have some marginal notes and interlinear glosses not very closely related to the extant scholia, which indeed do not cover *Id.* 22, 24 or 26. Those in P. Oxy. 2064 are nearly all too fragmentary to be intelligible. In P. Ant. it is noteworthy that they do not always agree with the text. At 15. 16 and 18. 40, where the latter gives the vulgate, the notes suggest ἀγοράσδειν and ἐρψωμες: at 15. 143, on the other hand, where the text has ἵλαος ὦ, the note might rather be thought to reflect the vulgate. Dr. Hunt's scholarly commentary notes only the first case, which is important for the text. I mention the others since discrepancies suggest, either that such notes come from a source other than the text, or that the exemplar copied contained variant readings.² For the rest, the notes disclose that 24 ended with a prayer, and at 15. 30, where the text is missing, they confirm Hermann's δὲ σμῆμα, but I have not sucked much

¹ καὶ εἴρου, the ι of καὶ erased, the α written over an original α or α. Meineke long since conjectured κεν εἴρου, which I believe to be right. But the whole line should be given to Gorgo; from Praxinoa the phrase seems meaningless. K also reads κἀ, which Legrand retains; I should not venture.

² Dr. Hunt does not distinguish the hands of the annotators, but thinks, if I understand him aright, that there are at least two, of whom one may be the scribe of the text. It would be of importance to ascertain whether the discrepant notes are likely to be his or not. I should like to know also to whom we owe the news that Alexandria is in Egypt (15. 48)—and for whom he penned such a note.

other sustenance from them, for the writers were neither intelligent nor well-informed. One may have been a Copt, for he once breaks into that language; but if he or another at 2. 35 wrote or copied, as here reported, ἐπειδὴ ἐν νυκτὶ βαστάζουσι, it must have been by accident, for he meant βαύζουσι.

The existence of P. Ant. has been public knowledge for many years, and publication was originally promised for 1915. It would not be fair to blame Dr. Johnson or Dr. Hunt for the delay, but there are grounds for Wilamowitz's complaint (*Erinnerungen*, p. 261), for the long suspense has been unfortunate. One of its results is to increase the feeling of disappointment which the first view of this book produces. The text of Theocritus is admittedly in the main a good one, but there are various obscurities on which it was natural to hope for light, and very few of them receive it. Our texts, so far as I can see, will not

in future be much better, or even much different. On the other hand, there are compensations. P. Ant. confirms, by its variants and additions, the close kinship of our MSS.; by its agreements with them, the faithfulness with which they represent fifth-century tradition. Moreover, though I have not balanced the account between P. Ant. and K, my general impression, reinforced by a count over one hundred lines, is that the thirteenth-century MS. is a good deal more valuable than the fifth-century papyrus. P. Oxy. 2064, so far as it goes, confirms these conclusions and carries the evidence three centuries further back. And finally, the order of the poems in these papyri should give pause to future editors who think of rearranging them—and that in itself is something.

A. S. F. Gow.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

MARTHA'S DE FINIBUS III.-V.

Cicéron : *Des Termes extrêmes des Biens et des Maux*. Tome II. (Livres III.-V.) Par JULES MARTHA. Pp. 343. Paris : Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 20 fr.

THIS volume completes M. Martha's valuable explanatory translation. A short extract will show his method: III. 10 'Pardon, reprit-il, il n'y a pas du tout accord sur le fond. Du moment que tu dis, en effet, qu'en dehors de la moralité il existe une chose ou une autre à rechercher et que cette chose, tu la comptes au nombre des biens, l'éclat de la moralité même, c'est à dire ce qui fait en quelque sort briller la vertu, se trouve éteint et, du même coup, la vertu est ruinée de fond en comble.'

The Latin contains thirty words.

A 'show passage' in the Latin is V. 55. This runs in French:

'Mais, parmi les indications que fournit la nature, il y en a de plus claires encore, disons mieux, de tout à fait évidentes et qui ne peuvent pas le moins du monde être mises en doute: c'est ainsi que chez tout animal, et tout particulièrement chez l'homme, l'âme a une tendance à toujours agir et de ne

pouvoir, à aucun prix, s'accommoder d'un perpétuel repos. La chose est aisée à voir dans les premiers temps de la toute petite enfance. Je reviens peut-être trop souvent, je le crains, à ces sortes d'exemple; mais je fais comme tous les anciens philosophes, et particulièrement nos maîtres, qui s'approchent des berceaux, parce que c'est chez l'enfance qu'ils croient pouvoir le plus aisément reconnaître les intentions de la nature. Nous voyons donc à quel point les tout petits enfants sont incapables de se tenir en repos. Quand ils ont un peu grandi, ils prennent plaisir à des jeux, mêmes pénibles, et cela sans qu'on puisse, même par les coups, les en empêcher; et ce besoin d'activité ne cesse de se développer avec les années.'

The critical notes give a full picture of the MSS., often recording manifestly erroneous variations. I will take some places where I accept M. Martha's results and some where I doubt them:

III. 2 *nec uero ullum probetur* [ut] *summum bonum*, ed. with Madvig. Müller's *probetur oportet summum* is worth

mention, but Reid's *probatur* [ut] most probable.

III. 7 *nil operae rei p. detrahens*: 'il ne dérobaient rien au service de la république.' Most probably *operae* is gen. and *rei* p. dat.

III. 8 *omnibus excellens*: 'qui pour tout le monde fut un homme supérieur.' Rather 'eminent in all things'—*omnibus* and *omnium* from *omnia* are surely common.

III. 21 *simul autem cepit intelligentiam uel notionem potius*: 'mais aussitôt qu'il a compris cela, ou qu'il en a acquis, pour mieux dire, la notion,' 'cela' and 'en' referring to the clause before. More probably *intelligentia* and *notio* are a general mental quality.

III. 22 *fin. sicut nos ultimum in bonis*, etc.: ed. writes *sic* nos with Goerenz, brackets *sic illi collineet* with Orsini, and writes *sit* (for *sed*) *hoc quasi ultimum* with Ernesti.

III. 23 French is lucky to possess 'les convenables' for *officia*.

III. 24 *fin. omnes numeros uirtutis*: 'tout ce dont l'harmonie constitue la vertu.' Perhaps 'all the factors of virtue,' ἀριθμοί.

III. 26 *consectaria*, 'raisonnements bien liés.'

III. 30 *quae quanquam*, etc.: 'cette doctrine' (not the *uarias sententias* just before); no doubt right; *quae* often = *quod*.

III. 36 *his* [Stoicis]: Reid preferred [his] Stoicis, supposing that Stoicis had been copied by error *istoicis*, like *expectare* for *exspectare*.

III. 38 *in honesta familia institutus et educatus ingenue*: 'élevé dans une famille honorable, pourvu d'une éducation libérale.' More probably in *familia* and *ingenue* both go with both participles; to be quite precise, *institutus* means 'éducation,' *educatus*, 'élevé.'

III. 41 *quam tractatam*—*rem in summum discrimen adducit*: M. Martha skates round the double accusative; but better read *qua tractata*.

III. 46 *anteponentur*: Madvig's *anteponit* rightly rejected.

III. 52 *quorum ordo proxime accedit ut secundus sit ad regium principatum*: 'dont le rang, tout en étant le second, se rapproche cependant le plus de la souveraineté royale.' Rather 'whose rank

comes next, so as to be second to the royal pre-eminence.'

III. 65 *quodque . . . nemo uelit*: ed. adopts Bremi's *quomque*, but *quod* is defensible, since *uelit* means 'would wish (on the unlikely supposition of being given the choice).'

III. 69 *fin. Lambinus' emolumenta <et detrimenta>* should be mentioned; it gives the antithesis to *recto facta et peccata*.

IV. 1 *sed tamen accurate*: 'du moins tant d'application,' apparently accepting Lambinus' *tamen <tam>*, but without note. Perhaps bracket *accurate* as a note on *diligenter*, and take *sed tamen* as concluding the parenthetic clause that precedes it.

IV. 7 *aut non potuerunt aut uoluerunt* accepted as parenthetic, 'soit impuissance, soit propos délibéré'; Cobet's *potuerunt <tuere>* is not mentioned.

IV. 30 *quia momentum aliquod habeat ad iucundum (or -dam) accessionem*, MSS.; Lambinus' *accessio* is accepted, 'qui au point de vue de l'agrément pèse quelque chose.' Doubtful Latin, but I know no good emendation.

IV. 35 *si <est> nihil in eo quod perficiendum est*: ed. with Schiche (and his <est> four lines below); Madvig's *in quo (= aliquo animali) for in eo quod* is ignored. I still think *in eo . . . est* an interpolated note (the antecedent of *quod* being not *eo* but *nihil*); the hypothesis is that *homo = animus* (§ 27), here given as *ratio*. *Huic* that follows means 'this creature,' man who is only mind.

IV. 43 *praeponunt* (with most editors) and 46 *praeponi* (with Robin) for MS. *pro-*. Perhaps unnecessary, though of course Cicero is thinking of προάγειν, προηγμένα.

IV. 58 *nil habere in sese appellationis* (ed., MSS. *appetitionis*) *de qua saepe iam diximus*: 'n'ont rien en elles-mêmes des épithètes que nous avons souvent employées.' Doubtful Latin; true, the text seems to contradict *appetitionem animi moueri* just above, but *in sese* is emphatic, and the whole passage is loosely written.

IV. 74 *<ceteros> omnia contraria* (sc. *solum formosum*, etc., just before): decidedly preferable to Madvig's <stultos>.

V. 16. For *cum igitur*, ed. accepts *est igitur* of inferior MSS.; I prefer Müller's ingenious <inuen>um *igitur*, repeating *inuenta* above.

V. 24 *simul ut ortum est* with some MSS. The best have *simul et*, Madvig *simul* [et]. But M. Martha accepts II. 33 *simul et ortum est* (Schiche, for MSS. *simul et ortum et*); and Reid's *Academica*, p. 22, notes *simul et* as Ciceronian.

V. 28 *qui ipsi sibi* (v. ll. *qui si ipsi, qui sibi ipsi*). My *qui si ipsi sibi* seems worth consideration.

V. 44. Müller's *rebus iis* (MSS. *rebus hijs, rebus ipsis*; Madvig, [rebus] *iis*) printed without note, and translated 'l'un et l'autre' (i.e. 'notre corps et notre âme'). Cf. § 46 *his rebus* after

cuiusque partis naturae et in corpore et in animo.

V. 49 *cariores* <esse> ed. (noting '<esse> *cariores*, Lambinus uitiōse propter clausulam').

V. 55 *quod arbitrantur* with Müller and inferior MSS. I keep *quod arbitrentur*, 'giving it as their reason that they think.'

V. 56 *Quae . . . sequuntur tanquam utentes duce natura*, ed. for MSS. *utentes sequuntur tanquam duce natura* or *u. s. duce natura tanquam*. Very probable.

V. 76 *Quis enim potest ea quae probabilia uideantur ei non probare?* Inferior MSS. give *ea* for *ei*; I question *ei*, and prefer my *potest, quae probabilia* <*sibi*> *uideantur, ea*. H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

THE ORPHIC ARGONAUTICA.

Les Argonautiques d'Orphée: Texte et Traduction. By GEORGES DOTTIN. Pp. clx + 106. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 50 fr.

THIS edition of the Orphic Argonautica, with its lavish Introduction, text, translation, and *apparatus criticus* and indices, will be of great service to the student of later Greek, and should also make accessible to the general student a curious poem which has hitherto been the preserve of the specialist.

The Introduction is long, but its very length makes it possible to avoid irritating references to literature which is not easily accessible. The first 45 pages give a comprehensive review of the sources of the legend, and a comparative survey of its details under the four headings of The Origin and Aim of the Expedition, The Outward Journey, The Adventures in Colchis, and The Return.

More interesting and more valuable are two of the sections which follow: (a) The comparison (pp. xlvi-lxxv) with the poem of Apollonius, and in particular the detailed analysis of the treatment of legends and geography; and (b) the painstaking and elaborate

survey (pp. cii-cxlv) of grammar, vocabulary, and metre. The latter section is made the more valuable by an Index Verborum of 36 pages at the end of the volume, in which separate signs distinguish words of Homeric and of later origin from those peculiar to the poem.

For the text, the editor follows MSS. rather than editors, and of editors, Gesner in preference to Abel. This conservative policy has been pushed to the extreme of ignoring Abel entirely in the critical notes, and the reader would do well to have the rival edition at his side, if only to realise from what he has on occasions been preserved.

It is to be regretted that the proof-reading leaves much to be desired, e.g. in the Introduction, lix. n. 1, the omission of the reference, and cxv. 1. 16, καλέονσι for καλέουσι; and in the text, l. 51, the position of the enclitic, l. 66, the nom. Τριτογενείη for the dative, etc.; and in the Index there are 84 omissions, 13 wrong attributions, 28 incomplete references and 5 misprints.

M. M. GILLIES.

University College, Hull.

OVID IN THE LOEB LIBRARY.

Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems. (Loeb Classical Library.) By J. H. MOZLEY. Pp. xiv + 382. London: Heinemann, 1929. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THIS volume of the Loeb Ovid contains the didactic poems on love, the *De Medicamine Faciei*, the *Ars Amatoria* and the *Remedium Amoris*, the *Ibis*, the fragment of the *Halieuticon*, the poem on the walnut-tree, and the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which last the editor rightly considers spurious, though he refers to the author as Ovid in the footnote on p. 324. The translation is for the most part readable without failing to be literal as in a work of this kind it should be, but there is an occasional eccentricity of style, such as 'Hylas stolen by naughty Naiads,' p. 73, which is quite out of harmony with the tone of the rest, or 'Come wandering Aura and refresh my sultriness,' p. 167. The translator is too fond of rendering the Latin by the English word nearest to it in sound; thus on the first page alone 'sterile,' 'adopted,' and 'rubicund' are so used, and in *Ars Am.* III. 661 *credula* is translated 'credulous' where a word with a somewhat wider sense is really required.

There is rather a large number of slips. In *Ars Am.* I. 119 it is surely unlikely that *ruentes* is to be construed with *illae*, if only because it requires an unnatural meaning for *sine more*. In line 133 of the same book *sollemnia* is untranslated; in 152 'let any pretext serve your turn' is not adequate for 'let any pretext serve to show your dutifulness'; in 448 it hardly does to translate *praeteritum* as 'gift' without further explanation; 692 *petas* is rendered as if it were indicative. Line III

of Book III. means 'If you were the wife of Ajax, would you come to him all dressed up?' not 'What? would you come arrayed like the spouse of Ajax?' In 170 the text gives *de Tyrio*, but the translation is of the inferior reading *bis Tyrio*. In the *Ibis*, line 52, *brevi* must mean 'for a short time,' not 'easily.' In *Halieuticon* 37 *brachia dissolvit*, 'he loosens his grip,' is strangely rendered by 'his arms melt away.' *Consol. Liv.* 228 means not 'he left the body unharmed,' but 'he intended to carry off the body unharmed.' The footnotes, an important feature where so much of the matter is highly obscure, are at once concise and clear. But *Mimallonides*, *Ars Am.* I. 541, *Clario deo* II. 80, and the star of the *falciferi senis*, *Ibis* 216, could have done with a word of explanation. And there are too many misprints, especially in the *Ibis*, though there it is easy to forgive a proof-reader for drowsing; the full stop at the top of p. 36 should be a comma, and on p. 280, the third line should contain one comma more or one less. On p. 271 *Telephus* is given for *Telemus*; p. 278 *Pherelas* for *Pterelas*; p. 288, line 19, *ad* which should be the penultimate word is omitted; p. 313, the reference to footnote 2 is given as 4 in the text; p. 348, last line, *persolvenda* should read *persoluenda*.

There is a full and amusing appendix to the *Ibis* on ancient cursing. But if 'the gods are *σχέτλιοι*, act out of pure cussedness,' they should not be compared to the peasant who pulls his pig backwards to get it into the sty, but to the pig who has to be pulled (p. 362).

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College,
Cambridge.

STUDIES IN TIBULLUS.

Tibull-Studien. Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls und des Corpus Tibullianum. Dr. MAURIZ SCHUSTER. Pp. vii + 202. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1930. Paper, M.7.50.

IT might be thought that the frail and elegant poems of Tibullus would

prove an inadequate foundation for a work of two hundred large pages. Indeed Dr. Schuster has achieved a certain expansion by his readiness to expound the obvious at generous length and by devoting a certain amount of space to the refutation of the errors of

his predecessors. For the rest he is usually sensible and sometimes illuminating.

The book falls into three parts. The first is devoted to questions of form and composition. Dr. Schuster rejects with equal firmness the attempts of Witte to find a system of numerical correspondences in the structure of the poems and the theory of J. van Wageningen that Tibullus was an *Ideenflüchtiger* with defective zerebraler Sekundärfunktion and so incapable of structure at all. His own view, and that probably of most readers, is that the charge of formlessness cannot be supported, and that Tibullus is singularly successful in departing, to all appearances, from his main theme, and then showing by a return to it through a number of deft and easy steps that he was in complete control throughout the digression, a technique which, as Dr. Schuster points out, has something in common with Pindar's. The theory is illustrated by analyses of the third and seventh poems of the first book, which are generally sound though of unnecessary length. A few particular points are doubtful. Thus the description of the golden age 1. 3. 35 f. occurs naturally, not because it is introduced by the phrase *antiquo Lari*, but because of the thought implied that in the old days, before there were ships to travel by, *priusquam tellus in longas est patefacta vias*, the poet could not have found himself ill and sick for home in distant Corcyra. The exploits of Messalla in Egypt may very possibly be the explanation of the curious digression on that country 1. 7. 23 f., but the information that 'our historical sources

are here unfortunately scanty,' and that there is no independent evidence that Messalla ever set foot in Egypt, should not have been withdrawn to a footnote.

In the second section, which deals with the life and character of Tibullus, the author exercises a welcome restraint and is not, like so many commentators, over-confident of his ability to extract the poet whole from his works. His conclusion that the elegies on Delia, Nemesis, and Marathus are neither pure autobiography nor completely imaginary is as probable as any.

The last part of the book is concerned with the text; this again is too long. No one wants a host of examples to show that *nitere* is an appropriate word to describe the shining of metal. The author has few suggestions of his own to contribute, but holds the balance between existent readings with some discrimination. An excessive conservatism sometimes leads him to defend the indefensible. In 3. 3. 38 *Dives* as a proper name, a by-form of *Dis*, will appeal to few. At 3. 5. 11 he reads *sacrilegi templis amovimus aegros*, which would be more acceptable if he could offer parallels to show that ejecting the sick from temples was a conventional amusement of impious Romans. *Et ipse pariter medicande* 3. 6. 3 for 'thou too needest to be healed of love' is desperate.

There is an appendix, not of general interest, on the influence of Tibullus on German poets.

On p. 105 *exemplo* is a misprint for *exemplo*.

D. W. LUCAS.

King's College,
Cambridge.

MOREL'S APPENDIX VERGILIANA.

Poetae Latini minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Volumen I, Appendix Vergiliana. Exemplar anastatice iteratum curavit adnotationis supplemento auxit denuo emendavit WILLY MOREL. Pp. xii + 208. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Rm. 4.60 and 5.60.

THE late Friedrich Vollmer, after an unpromising start, became in the course of his life a considerable scholar and

even something of a critic, and so far as concerns the investigation and collation of MSS and the structure of an *apparatus criticus* he was almost the model of what an editor should be; but he remained to the end of his days the most incapable and insensible of conjectural emendators, and the simplest way to improve his very bad text of the *appendix Vergiliana* would be to eject nearly all his innovations. This volume

however is not a new edition but an anastatic reprint, and the changes made, though more than Mr Morel enumerates in his three pages of 'supplementa,' are necessarily few and small.

Mr Morel is not master of the subject. He has paid attention to what has been written on these poems since 1909, but shows no great knowledge of anything earlier; and the new conjectures which he singles out are far inferior to dozens of old ones which Vollmer neglected or suppressed. For example, when *Cir.* 48 'impia prodigiis ut quondam exterruit amplis' has been corrected by Heinsius and Schrader to *exterrita miris*, who wants to be bothered with such things as *pro Stygiis* . . . *exterrita* <te> *mplis*? Mr Muenscher's *rhoezo* at *catal.* 5 2 is excellent, Mr Reitzenstein's *moles, frustra* at *Aetn.* 489 is satisfying, and there is something to be said for one or two of Mr Morel's own, *Cul.* 243 *quod for qui* or *de*, *Aetn.* 380 *conualuere mora*; but on the whole it is a wretched show. Mr Birt's *Centaureum* at *catal.* 11 2 is the very type of a thoughtless conjecture: if Virgil had written this he could no more have added *poacula* than Callimachus added *oivos*.

The following notes will fill some gaps in Mr Morel's knowledge.

Cul. 141 'monent Sillig.' He took it from one of the *codd. Vossiani*.

Cul. 269 'poenane Schenkl.' Karl or

Heinrich? The former, *Zeitschr. f. d. oesterr. Gymn.*, 1867, p. 783.

Cul. 301 '*sociatae* Klotz cum v.' *Bembus*, Scaliger, Heinsius, Ribbeck, Ellis cum V.

Cul. 326 '*alma* Fr. Marx, *Moloss* . . . *Wortformen* p. 225.' It was the vulgate for 300 years and more.

Copa 4 '*ad* . . . *calamos coniungendum esse recte* monuit Bannier *Thes. l. L.* III 124 24.' It was Leo *Cul.* pp. 44 f.; whether '*recte*' is another matter. Those who obey Mr Morel and turn to Weege *Der Tanz in der Antike* p. 127 tab. 181 will be disappointed of their expectations.

Cir. 53 '*pro patria Leonem secutus scripsi*.' Et Hauptium secutus Leo.

Priap. 3 17 '*huic* Ribbeck.' This conjecture is unmetrical, and Ribbeck, having proposed it in 1868, abandoned it in 1895 for *tot*.

Aetn. 152 '*crusta est nescioquis apud Gerckium—locum nunc non inuenio*.' An editor of the *app. Verg.* ought to know of Haupt.

The coinage *reimpressionis* on p. ix is presumably a reverent imitation of Vollmer, who explained *renauit* in *Manil.* V 609 as *reenauit*.

I see that corrections which I sent to Vollmer have been embodied in the apparatus at *Cul.* 9, 57, 90, 231, 232, 353. His reports of V at 71, 98 f., 191 are not quite exact, but it does not matter.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

OVID'S FASTI.

Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex. The *Fasti* of Ovid, edited with a translation and commentary by SIR JAMES GEORGE FRAZER, O.M., F.R.S., F.B.A. Five volumes. Pp. xxix + 357, 512, 421, 353, 212. Eighty-eight plates and seven maps and plans in Vol. V. London: Macmillan and Co. 1929. Cloth, £6 6s. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri VI.* Recensuit CAROLUS LANDI. Pp. xliii + 236. Turin, Milan, etc.: Paravia. 1928. Paper, 20 lire.

THERE can be no doubt that Frazer's *Fasti* is the most important full edition of a Latin classic published in England since the war. An edition of the *Fasti*, in

which the subject-matter might be considered in the light of the modern study of anthropology and comparative religion, has long been wanted, and from no editor could it have been more welcome than from Sir James. He has attacked his task with all his wonted vigour and thoroughness of method, and it provides scope for his scholarship and his archaeology as well as for his wide-flung knowledge of anthropology. If a critic must criticise, he may say firmly at the outset that the greatly preponderating feeling is one of admiration and gratitude.

The plan of the work is simple: Vol. I. contains a short introduction on

MSS., editions, and authorities, the text with critical apparatus, and a translation; Vols. II., III., and IV. are occupied with the commentary, each containing two books; Vol. V. contains indices, illustrations, and plans.

It is interesting to compare Sir James's text with that of C. Landi published in the Paravia series a few months earlier. The latter follows in the tradition of recent texts and bears a strong family resemblance to the Ehwald-Levy Teubner text of 1924, to which the editor handsomely acknowledges his debt. Mr. Landi has availed himself of recent recensions of the more important MSS. and has himself done much work in collation. He holds to the belief in the supremacy of A (Petavianus), but is inclined to attach more importance than earlier editors to U (Ursinianus); D (Mallersdorfiensis) he believes to be a much interpolated school-text. Useful readings are also to be found in other early texts, both Transalpine and Italian, of which Mr. Landi has examined large numbers. On the vexed question of the relation of the Gemblacensis and Mazarinianus and the citations in Lactantius Mr. Landi follows the view of E. H. Alton (*Hermathena* XLIV, 1926) and thinks that they may all go back to a less corrupted archetype.

The text constructed on this basis is an attempt to follow the indications of modern criticism without slavish adherence, and is on the whole sound. A few of the editor's own emendations are introduced, but are not convincing. In II. 669 *invictus* for *inventus* AUDM is gratuitous; in IV. 709 *degere captam* would explain the variants *vivere* U and *dicere* A, but in spite of the parallels quoted it is awkward Latin; in II. 638 *sub sacra verba* seems no better than the many other suggested emendations; in VI. 757 the text has *Lachesis Clymenusque*, which comes from Levy's note, but in the apparatus we find *Lachesis Climesque* (sic), of which I can make nothing.

Not the least valuable part of the edition is the full list of authorities in the introduction (pp. xxxiii-xxxix), and in particular the bibliography of articles

on special festivals and deities of the Roman religion.

Sir James Frazer's attitude to the text is, as might be expected, independent and original. Having procured rotographs of the six principal MSS., A, U, D, X (Gemblacensis), M (Mazarinianus), and m (Oxonienensis), he has based his recension on his own reading of them and, as he tells us (I. xxvi.), has only on rare occasions been obliged to go outside of them. He is fully cognizant of the work of previous editors and critics, but has taken his own line. The result is what may fairly be described as an eclectic text with a hardly concealed leaning towards U (see the note on III. 462), except—oddly enough—after V. 24, where A ceases, when U is apt to be supplanted in Sir James's preference by D.

I have not space to deal fully with the resulting text, but certain salient points may be noticed. In several places Sir James has in my view successfully vindicated the MS. text: e.g. I. 148 *pauca* AUDM as against many conjectures designed to make the phrase consistent with *multis* in 161; I. 387 *triplici* ADM against the *geminæ* usually adopted from the inferior MSS., *triplici* being due to the same confusion of Diana with the 'triple' Hecate already made by Ovid in I. 141. Among the passages where U is preferred to A may be noted III. 219 *passis* (scissis) A *capillis*, which a valuable note on the respective significance of dishevelled and torn hair shows to be right. Similarly in III. 462 a common-sense note proves U's *legenda* against A's *regenda*. In IV. 295 I am convinced by the note that *nataeque* (D) *murisque* (U) is right as against the generally accepted *natiqve* (AUXM) *virique* (ADXM). In the last two books, after A stops, may be noted the restoration (VI. 582) of *ducis* (UDXMm) as against the traditional *senis*, which Frazer states has no MS. authority.

But this general belief in U does not prevent Sir James from deserting both it and A when he thinks he can get better sense from the inferior MSS. It appears to me that he has so improved the traditional text in many places: e.g. II. 93 *urbes* (DXM²) is far

better sense than *undas* (AUMm¹); IV. 45 *recidiva* (Dm¹) is a much stronger reading than *repetita* (AUXMm²) (and it is incidentally supported by Virgil's *recidiva Pergama* in *Aen.* IV. 344); IV. 724 *festa* (Xm¹) is an attractive change from *facta* (AUDMm²); V. 427 *somno . . . praebet* (DXMm¹) has really the weight of authority against *somnos . . . praebent* (Um²). But in several places the editor seems less happy in throwing over the higher authority of A and U. I. 210 *summos . . . deos* is not justified by the parallels quoted in the commentary; IV. 709 *dicere certa* is not, as stated in the note, the 'text of the great majority of MSS.,' which have *dicere certam*, and, while *certa* is feeble, *dicere* is questionable in the sense of 'to name'; in IV. 755 the subjunctive *degrandinet* (D) is unnecessary, the indicative being idiomatic in this sense (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* IX. 23), and in VI. 434 *eripuisse* is definitely bad grammar—there is no reason for a subjunctive—and *eam* very weak; in V. 335 it is true that *tota* (UDXMm) is feeble, but *pota* (one MS. and Heinsius) *tempora* in the sense of *ebriorum tempora* is surely impossible.

The editor does not print any conjectures of his own in the text, but makes several suggestions in the critical notes, which are all interesting, but none to my mind convincing. In II. 575 a desire for ritual consistency with passages in other authors has prompted *tria* for *cum*; *secessit* for *recessit* in V. 12 is an unfortunate suggestion; *medium . . . locum* for *sedem . . . suam* in VI. 268 is much too remote; in VI. 401 *hic* would no doubt be an improvement on *hoc*, but *tremuere* (UXm²) is strained even in Ovid; the suggestions on IV. 441 *multi et*, V. 21 *textit*, and VI. 75 *nomine* all appear to me gratuitous.

A few small blemishes may also be noted: in IV. 451 and VI. 598 the critical notes do not correspond to the text, the rejected reading being placed first; in II. 533 the translation quoted in the commentary (Vol. II., p. 431) does not correspond to the translation in Vol. I. or to the text (*extinctas*); and in VI. 652 there is an odd misprint

in the critical apparatus, *flavae . . . ravae* for *flava . . . rava*.

The translation, which faces the text in Vol. I., gives an adequate interpretation of the meaning, but can hardly be regarded as a finally satisfactory English rendering. Ovid no doubt presents special difficulties to the translator; he is at times prosily archaeological or argumentative, at times genuinely poetical, and again mock-heroic and slyly cynical. Yet the *Fasti* does give the impression of a uniform style, and Sir James's attempt to represent the differing moods produces a patchy effect: his jumps are too sudden, his lapses into the colloquial or prosaic diction too marked. The following passage from the story of Arion (II. 111 ff.) may be taken as characteristic:

'Straightway, with all his finery on, he leaped plump down into the waves: the reffluent water splashed the azure poop. Thereupon they say (it sounds past credence) a dolphin did submit his arched back to the unusual weight; seated there Arion grasped his lyre and paid his fare in song, and with his chant he charmed the ocean waves.'

There are many brilliant renderings of individual phrases: e.g. IV. 554 'the burden of humanity' (*humanum onus*), V. 333 'strait-laced' (*severum*), V. 351 'high-flown' (*magna professis*), VI. 109 'to scour the countryside' (*rura sequi*). Opinions may differ on the 'billy-goat' of I. 354 and the 'nanny-goats' of IV. 511. The use of words or phrases with strong modern associations also raises questions: 'All Souls' Days' is perhaps a legitimate equivalent for *Parentales dies* (II. 548), but 'parish,' which represents *pagus* in I. 669 and *vicus* in V. 146, has too definite a tinge, and so have 'the Prime Warden' (*curio* II. 527) and 'colonel' (*tribunus* IV. 381).

In a few places the accuracy of the translation may be questioned. In I. 322 'Shall I proceed?' loses the ritual force of *agone*; in I. 598 *virtus* is not 'goodness' but 'prowess'; in I. 649 *rebus* not 'life' but 'fortune'; in III. 97 *hos omnes ut vinceret ordine* does not mean 'that he might take precedence of all these,' but 'that he

might do better in the ordering of the year'; and neither in III. 623 nor anywhere else can *nil non* mean 'something.'

If the translation leaves one with a feeling of slight disappointment, it is because in spite of many *lumina ingenii*, it seems a little lacking in *ars*.

To the great majority of readers the main interest of Sir James Frazer's edition will lie in the three volumes of the Commentary. It is perhaps to be regretted that these notes were originally designed to accompany a volume in the Loeb series and are therefore written not on the Latin text, but on the English translation. The result is that discussion of points of text or scholarship has little place in them, and when it does occur, it is made somewhat clumsy by the necessity of adapting it to the English reader. But of every other kind of comment on history, on archaeology and art, on religion, folklore and anthropology there is an unstinted wealth: only in the field of astronomy the editor does not trust himself and takes his lead from Ideler's still valuable disquisition *Über den astronomischen Theil der Fasti des Ovid* (Berlin, 1825).

Of the accuracy of the many fascinating archaeological notes on architecture, sculpture, coins and topography I am not qualified to speak, but there can be no doubt that taken together with the admirable photographs and plans in Volume V. they add greatly to the reality and vitality of a reading of the *Fasti* and not infrequently clear up points of obscurity in the text. As instances may be quoted the illuminating note on the successive Temples of Concord (on I. 637), a valuable discussion of Laurentum and Lavinium (on II. 679), a long discussion of the Temple of Vesta (on VI. 257), and as an example of a topographical exposition on an obscure point the note on the Nova Via on VI. 395. It is in notes like these that we feel the editor of Pausanias among us again.

The main bulk of the 1,286 pages of commentary is occupied with the discussion and explanation of Roman customs and of the rites and conceptions of Roman religion. Many new and

valuable suggestions are made and almost every point is illustrated from Sir James's great anthropological storehouse, examples being taken from peoples in all parts of the world and in almost every stage of cultural development. We meet the Esquimaux, the Maoris, the tribes of Borneo, the Banyankole and Banyoro of Uganda, the Germany of Tacitus and the Germany of yesterday. The validity of all this wealth of illustration depends of course on the ultimate postulate of Sir James's anthropology, that 'human nature is much the same all the world over and in all ages' (Vol. II., p. 431). A more sceptical mind finds itself here, as in the reading of *The Golden Bough*, inclined to urge firstly, that known racial kinship greatly increases the probability of similarity of motive in action, and that there is therefore greater likelihood in the explanation of the Romans by the Greeks, or the Banyoro by the Banyankole, than there is in that of the Greeks by the Banyoro; and secondly, that, except in matters of simple and primitive custom of known universality, it is dangerous to argue from resemblance of practice to similarity of motive, unless we can be very sure of the similarity of circumstances and thought. Thus on the one hand one feels confidence in the illustration of the *Parilia* by the rites observed in Eastern Europe on St. George's Day, because, as Sir James himself says (Vol. III., p. 339), 'they may well be connected by descent from a common festival observed by pastoral Aryan peoples in the spring.' Or again Sir James's theory that a blank winter period in the agricultural year is the true explanation of the old ten-month calendar receives strong support from the customs of certain primitive tribes in Africa and elsewhere (Vol. II., pp. 16 ff.), because we are dealing with circumstances which are necessarily the same 'all the world over.' But on the other hand it is difficult to feel that the ritual of re-birth from a goat practised by the Kikuyu of Mont Kenya (Vol. II., pp. 341 ff.) helps in any real degree towards the understanding of the Lupercalia, for the circumstances are too unlike, and the coincidence that this 'goat-birth' took place under a fig-tree

(p. 343) cannot seriously be thought to throw light on the *caprificus* under which Romulus and Remus were suckled by the wolf. No doubt Sir James would be the first to recognise varying degrees of relevance in his anthropological parallels, and would not be surprised if his readers feel some of them far-fetched, such as the suggestion of totemism and exogamy in the myths of Lycaon and Callisto (Vol. II., p. 319), or of the origin of the chastity of the Vestal Virgins in a sex interpretation of the fire-drill held by the Loango of Western Africa and the Djakuns of the Malay Peninsula (Vol. IV., pp. 208, 9).

And even if we accept the view of the fundamental similarity of mankind, there is yet a corollary which the anthropologist is apt to overlook—namely, that every people, whatever its starting-point, has its own psychology and its own characteristic development. If there is one general complaint which might be brought against Sir James's commentary, it is that it does not sufficiently recognise the essential character of the Roman religion or distinguish between its various stages of development. The Roman religion as embodied in the Calendars, the religion of Numa, was an animism, retaining traces of more primitive magical rites, and in process of development into anthropomorphism: some of the 'spirits' had attained names and something of personality, but the characteristic title is *numen* and not *deus*. Sir James, still unrepentant since his earlier days, speaks consistently of the Roman religion as if it were a full-blown anthropomorphism. The word *numen* does not occur in the index to the Commentary, nor, to the best of my belief, is it anywhere mentioned in the notes, and in II. 642, when Ovid uses it of Terminus in just the old Roman sense—*tu quoque numen habes*—it is translated 'thou too hast been deified.' In a similar spirit the Roman deities are throughout spoken of as 'gods' in as complete a sense as the Greek gods, and the typically Roman divinity-pairs, representing the male and female principle, are described as husband and wife or brother and sister (Vol. II., pp. 208, 367; Vol. III., p. 121). So Saturnus

is regarded as an immigrant foreign deity (Vol. II., p. 122), an idea that could not have existed till after his identification with Kronos; Liber is spoken of as 'the Latin equivalent of Dionysus' (Vol. II., p. 146), which he certainly was not in origin; and we are told that the Genius 'was, properly speaking, a man's 'guardian god' (Vol. II., p. 438). These are all ideas expressed no doubt in Latin writers, but dating from the period after the influx of Greek anthropomorphism and not typical of the true Roman religion. Again, a student of Roman religion will sometimes find Sir James's notes inadequate on points of great interest in themselves, but not suggesting anthropological parallels: he is apt to be content to recite the later legends without attempting to penetrate behind them; one might cite the notes on Tarpeia (Vol. II., p. 128), Hercules and the Ara Maxima (Vol. II., pp. 213 ff.), Castor and Pollux (Vol. II., pp. 261 ff.), Minerva (Vol. III., p. 146) and the Lacus Curtius (Vol. IV., p. 243 ff.).

Nor is this want of sympathy with the Roman attitude of mind merely a regrettable lack, but it sometimes vitiates the writer's argument on important points. Thus in a long and important note on Janus (Vol. II., pp. 90 ff.) Sir James argues powerfully against the connexion of the name with *ianua* and in favour of an original Dianus. This may be a tenable position, but it can hardly be supported by the argument (p. 92) that 'a god who figured so constantly and so conspicuously in litanies and ritual was an important divinity, and it would be strange if a mere janitor or hall-porter among the gods had been promoted to this proud position.' Possibly, if we think of him as a developed god; but in the early Italian hut the 'spirit' of the door, its most vulnerable point, is at least as important as the spirits of the hearth (*Vesta*) and the store-cupboard (*Penates*), and it is not at all strange that in the family litany, on which that of the State was based, he should come first and *Vesta* last. Or again, in his note on *Fortuna Primigenia* (Vol. III., pp. 257 ff.) Sir James simply sweeps away the objections raised by Mr.

Warde Fowler and Professor Rose to the belief that she was from the first the 'first-born daughter' of Jupiter, because he does not contemplate the *numen* period at all or realise the ultimate grounds of objection to conceiving family relationships among divinities in the old Roman religion.

But these are the whinings of the specialist, and indeed such weak spots make a very small show amid the mass of valuable material and criticism which Sir James has given us. The book is full of new suggestions, many of which show a freshness of outlook which the specialist too often lacks, and will need careful weighing and consideration. Possibly the most important of these are contained in the long and valuable note (Vol. IV., pp. 74 ff.) on the much disputed ceremony of the *Argeorum sacra*, where in my opinion Sir James disposes of the Mannhardt theory, which has lately held the ground in England, that the puppets represent the dying spirit of vegetation, on the grounds that the date (May 15) is late, that there is no suggestion of a vegetation rite in the ceremony, that the puppets are made of rushes, not straw, and that the ritual was conducted by the Vestals, who have no other trace of connexion with vegetation. He propounds two alternative theories, both new, that the ceremony was an expulsion of ghosts (*Argei*—the 'white' people), and that it was an offering for the safety of the Pons Sublicius. Both of these views will have to be examined carefully. The former is connected with his general view of the attitude of the Romans towards the dead, which is expounded in equally valuable and suggestive notes on the Lares and the Compitalia (Vol. II., pp. 453 ff., cf. p. 479; and Vol. III., pp. 14 ff. on Acca Larentia, the Mother of the Lares),

where he strongly supports the view that the Lares were the spirits of the dead: there is much new material here for the reconsideration of an old controversy. Not less important is the suggestion of the possible connexion of the Nonae Caprotinae as a ceremony of 'caprification' with the Lupercalia (Vol. II., pp. 347 ff.) and with the Poplufugia and death of Romulus (pp. 415 ff.), though here a first impression is that the ground is less secure.

There are many other passages in the commentary to which attention might be drawn, and indeed there are very few of the notes on points of custom and religion which are not suggestive. To any student of Roman religion these volumes must for the future be a storehouse of material, all the more valuable for the wide sweep from which its illustrations are drawn, and a fountain-head of new views, many of which are likely to be accepted. The achievement is one which could have been accomplished by no one but Sir James Frazer.

It remains to note that Volume V. contains two valuable indices to the translation and the commentary besides the excellent plates and plans to which reference has already been made. It is to be regretted that there are no references to the plates embodied in the commentary, but they follow very nearly the sequence of subjects in the notes, and a reader who has the plates open before him will have no difficulty in finding the pictures he needs. The volumes are beautifully printed and got up in the manner which Messrs. Macmillan have led us to expect, and misprints are very rare, the most noticeable being a strange occasional absence of full-stops in the Latin text.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

THE STYLE OF THE SPEECHES IN LIVY.

Étude sur le Style des Discours de Tite Live. Par RAGNAR ULLMANN. Pp. 130. (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1928. No. 3.) Oslo: Dybwad, 1929. Paper, kr. 8.50.

THIS book may be regarded as a continuation of the same author's *La Technique des Discours dans Salluste, Tite Live, et Tacite* (noticed in C.R. XLII., 1928, pp. 198-9), where however the treatment was confined to the *inventio* and *divisio* of the speeches in

these three historians. The author now attempts to deal with the *elocutio* of the speeches in Livy, and to consider their oratorical style with reference to the precepts of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and more especially of Quintilian. The title of the book is promising, since no full treatment of the subject has been made, though various works have covered some of the ground. Yet the author can hardly claim to have supplied this need.

Dr. Ullmann's examples are taken from ninety direct speeches (all of sufficient length to be more than merely *dicta*). It is a great pity that the study did not include at any rate the longer speeches in *oratio obliqua*. Surely it is wrong to speak of these as only 'indications de matière,' and to ignore the fact that much oratorical artifice is employed in them by Livy. The arrangement of the book is as follows: Chapter I. deals briefly with *ἐνάρχεια*, with *similitudines*, *amplificatio*, and *sententiae*; Chapter II. with tropes (following Quintilian's definition); Chapter III. with figures (both of 'thought' and of 'words'); Chapter IV. with sentence arrangement (here Nägelsbach and Kühnast take the place of Quintilian and Cornificius); Chapter V. with sound and rhythm; and Chapter VI. with the *genera dicendi*. The first three chapters suffer from a certain amount of overlapping, due above all to the proverbial uncertainty about the distinctions to be made between tropes and figures and other ornamental devices. For this part of the work the author owes much to Canter's useful article on the 'Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches' (*A.J.P.* XXXVIII., 1917, pp. 125-151); yet he has added a considerable bulk of material, some of which he has obtained from Kühnast. When speaking of *sententiae*, he quite rightly points out in opposition to Canter that 26. 36. 13 provides an example of the *προμύθιον* and that there are several good examples of the *ἐπιφώνημα*. The section on metaphor is unsatisfactory. Kühnast's list has been used in so far as the examples there occur in speeches, but the additions made are not always reliable. For instance, under *incubare*

Ullmann quotes with Kühnast 6. 15. 5 *incubantes publicis thesauris*, but adds to this 31. 31. 20 *totis viribus in Macedoniam incubuimus* (quoting this passage in full, where the verb is surely *incumbo*). On the other hand, Chapter III. contains interesting material, when examples are given of *praesumptio* and of *προσωποποιία* (in the narrow sense given in Quint. IX. 2. 30 and not to be confused with the use of the term to describe the historian's invention of speeches), and an excellent section is included on *ισόκωλον*, *ὁμοιότελεuton*, and *ἀντιθέτον*. This, taken in conjunction with the study of chiasmus, anaphora, and asyndeton in the following chapter, forms perhaps the best part of the book. Chapter V. begins with a very sketchy survey of alliterative usages. If the author wished to deal with the subject at all (he might plead that, since it did not form a recognised part of ancient rhetorical study, it was not relevant to this book), he ought to have said much more about alliteration and assonance in Livy's characterising oratory. On rhythm, Dr. Ullmann's remarks and statistics are interesting, though they cannot be regarded as new, since the main facts were published by him in 1925,¹ following de Groot's *Der antike Prosarhythmus*. His statistics for *clausulae* in Livy's speeches are put side by side with those of Zieliński for Cicero, and the results can be summarised in (1) the marked preponderance of spondees in Livy, (2) the comparative frequency of the *clausula heroica* (8.3 per cent. in Livy's speeches to 0.6 per cent. in Cicero), and (3) the comparative frequency of the paeon as the last foot rather than the penultimate as preferred by Cicero. The final chapter on *genera dicendi* is far too short and not conclusive. After showing that the majority of the speeches in Livy can best be classified as belonging to the *genus medium*, the author tells us that Livy was skilful at adapting speeches to the character of the speaker both by the *ἦθος* and by the *πάθος*. But he makes no attempt to show us how the oratory characterises in each case. In short, the book provides some useful material,

¹ *Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. III.

but we are given the impression that it might have been a better piece of work if more time had been devoted to its composition.

Too many misprints have remained uncorrected. S. K. JOHNSON.

University College,
Swansea.

THE HARMONICA OF PTOLEMY.

Die Harmonielehre des Klaudios Ptolemaios. By INGEMAR DÜRING (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXVI., 1930: 1). Pp. cvi + 147. Göteborg: Elander, 1930. Paper, Kronor 10.

THIS excellent book is the first text of the *Ἀρμονικὰ* of Ptolemy to be published since the 1699 reprint of Wallis's *editio princeps* (1682). Whereas only eight MSS., and those of inferior value, were known to Wallis, Düring has examined eighty-four, and we now have a text which satisfies modern requirements.

The first part of the book (ix-xlv) is devoted to descriptions of the MSS., and amongst them are several which von Jan (*Mus. Script. Gr.*) does not mention. When descriptions are easily available elsewhere, Düring has curtailed his account; but I wish he had jettisoned still more of the details about other authors in the MSS., in favour of consistent indications of the last words of the Ptolemy text and of the presence of diagrams, scholia, and pinaces. The dating of the MSS. is more precise and accurate than in von Jan's lists; but I doubt whether Vat. gr. 186 is *early* thirteenth century, whether Pal. gr. 95 and Vat. gr. 191 were written by the same scribe, and whether Vat. gr. 176 is in the hand of Argyros. The Latin translation found in Harl. lat. 3306 is listed, but no mention is made of Ambros. R 133 sup. Here and there I have noted a few unimportant slips in the accounts of foliation; but these pages will prove very useful to many besides students of Ptolemy.

In pp. xlvi-lxix the MSS. are grouped, and all except thirty are shown to be really worthless for the constitution of a text. The common archetype was incomplete and in places obscure. Of Düring's three classes, one (m) reproduces this archetype faithfully, a second (f) shows early attempts at emendation, while the third (g) and fourth (A) classes represent the deliberate 'improvements'

of Nicephoros Gregoras and Isaac Argyros. The grouping is on the whole well-founded, and my own collations of all independent MSS. earlier than saec. xvi support it. The m group, however, is not quite as homogeneous as it appears in Düring's pages; for the ten MSS., of which Vat. gr. 192 is the chief, form a fairly clear subdivision; the lost parent of Düring's Nos. 15, 26, 72, 81 possibly represented another; and Neap. III. C 3 (with Urb. gr. 77) I should prefer to place among the 'mixed' MSS. In the subdivisions of f, Vat. gr. 187 is placed in the 'pure' group; but its readings in III. 13 (a chapter which Düring rightly stresses) make its inclusion there quite unsatisfactory. In all other respects, the details of the grouping are free from objection.

Pp. lxx-civ deal admirably with the history of Ptolemy's text and with the scholia. Of especial importance is Düring's defence (against Wallis and von Jan) of III. 16 as a genuine piece of Ptolemy; his arguments are convincing and the citation of Macrobius I. 19-20 is very strong testimony. The extant commentary Düring attributes in its entirety to Porphyrios, not to Pappos.

The text which Düring constructs, with m as his primary basis, is a great improvement on Wallis's; in view of his greater knowledge of MSS. and of the history of the text, it could scarcely be otherwise. A few of Wallis's emendations and a round score of the editor's are introduced where no possible help can be derived from the MSS. Lack of space forbids a proper discussion of the value of Düring's emendations, but this may be said: more than half of them are practically self-evident, and of the remainder not one is unreasonable. The excessive commas interspersed in Wallis's text have been eliminated with every advantage for the reader. The

apparatus criticus cites the four classes together with individual references to a number of early MSS. (especially of the *m* class). This part of the work has been done faithfully and skilfully; and though I miss some readings which would throw useful light on the character of individual MSS., no evidence is suppressed which would lead to any serious alteration of Düring's text. Possibly it would have been worth while to cite in some way the consensus of Nos. 15, 26, 72, 81; and in III. 13 (p. 108, 13) where Düring offers the emendation *ποιῶν*, and *ὄντα mgA οἶον*

*ἔω*¹ as his apparatus, the reading of Vat. gr 187 (*ἀ ποιῶσαι*) might have been recorded. There is a slip in the apparatus to p. 110, l. 25 (*partemque verae capitis*).

This work is the result of enormous industry, great insight, and sober judgment. After two and a half centuries of neglect, the *Ἀρμονικά* becomes one of the best edited of the Greek musical texts; and those interested in the subject will eagerly await Düring's promised edition of the Porphyrian commentary. J. F. MOUNTFORD.

Aberystwyth.

JEROME AND EUSEBIUS.

Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik und ihr Wert für die Literaturgeschichte. By RUDOLF HELM (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXI., Heft II.). Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1929. Pp. 98. Paper, M. 7.50 (bound, M. 9.0).

IN this treatise all the additions which Jerome made to the Chronicle of Eusebius, so far as they relate to the history of literature, are examined in detail, and Professor Helm has rendered it abundantly clear that with few exceptions these notices are derived from Suetonius and that no reliance can be placed on the exact dates given by Jerome.

Where so much is conclusive, it may seem invidious to select for notice those parts of the Professor's study which do not carry conviction. On pp. 4, 5 he endeavours to show that the first year of each Olympiad in Eusebius and Jerome is to be taken as referring to the consular year in which that Olympiad began, the second year to the following year and so on. The examples which he cites do not support this view, and he has clearly overlooked Dr. Turner's detailed discussion of the question in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, I. (1900), pp. 187-192, where it is shown conclusively that the years in the *Chronica* of Eusebius are reckoned from September and that the first year of

each Olympiad with him begins in the September of the year of the Olympic games, or eight months later than Professor Helm supposes. But Jerome in practice dates events with so little care that it is impossible to read so exact a rule into him. I doubt whether he had before him a reliable scheme for the conversion of consular dates into any of the systems of reckoning found in Eusebius, and I should not like to conjecture how often he miscounted the pairs of consuls between a given date and the nearest supposed synchronism.

I am also of opinion that Professor Helm has exaggerated the extent to which the false dates in Jerome are due to considerations of space. In Jerome the space assigned to each Olympiad has a minimum length of four lines *plus* the number of lines occupied in the *fila regnorum* by accessions and the like. But the space can be expanded to any extent by the notices in the *spatium historicum*. Jerome certainly tried to avoid blanks in his *spatium historicum*, but so long as there were notices sufficient to fill the minimum number of lines, considerations of space would not apply. In Jerome, as in many less distinguished writers, it is easy to find errors, but it is difficult or impossible to discover the causes of error.

J. K. FOTHERINGHAM.

Oxford.

LAMENTATIONS FOR ANIMALS.

Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung. Mit einem Anhang byzantinischer, mittel-lateinischer und neu-hochdeutscher Tierepikeden. By GERHARD HERRLINGER. Pp. x + 188. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 8. Heft.) 1930. Paper, Rm. 12.

DR. HERRLINGER'S book (dedicated to his teacher, Otto Weinreich) collects the classical poems which lament the death of animals. An introduction on the social background is followed by the text of the poems; those derived from literary sources are separated from those preserved in inscriptions; the former class is further divided according as the poems aim at genuine expression of sorrow, at parody, or at clever rhetorical effect (*ernst-sentimentale, parodistische, pointierte Epikeden*). Scholarly notes on the text (omitted for the poems of Ovid, Statius, Martial and Ausonius) record variant readings and emendations, and give useful information on the usage of words and phrases and such features of style as *homoioteleuton* and alliteration.

Part II. follows with an interesting appreciation of the extremely varied material collected in Part I. The *ernst-sentimentale Epikedium* is traced from the charming simplicity which characterised Anyte of Tegea and her successors through the pomposity of the Tarentine Leonidas, until in Archias is seen a transition to the 'pointed' style. Among the parodies are grouped the lament of Catullus for Lesbia's

sparrow, Ovid's poem on a friend's parrot, and that of Statius on a similar theme. These are *parodistisch* when they grieve for animals in the style of an elegy on human beings, or playfully attribute human characteristics to the dead animal, or exaggerate the pathos beyond the importance of the subject. In the 'pointed' *epikedium* the dead animal is no longer the central theme; it merely supplies an occasion for a pithy antithesis or some other rhetorical point. Martial is rightly hailed as the greatest exponent of this form of poetry, his effects being comparatively natural and those of his rivals far-fetched.

The poems in inscriptions (confined to horse and dog) are mainly *ernst*, though not without elements of the other two styles. The author carefully describes the form and content of these poems and their resemblances to and differences from inscriptions honouring human beings; for instance, the grave-stones of animals are peculiar in that they never solicit sympathy expressly or contain philosophical reflections.

Eschatology in the poems is discussed, and the author concludes rather sadly that the *ernst-sentimentale Epikedium* lacked full development because the animal in antiquity had no intrinsic value and was lamented not for its own sake but for its owner's.

In an appendix are collected the Byzantine, mediaeval Latin and modern German poems on the death of animals.

ARNOLD M. DUFF.

King's College, Aberdeen.

BYZANTINE POETRY.

Byzantinische Dichtung: ausgewählte Texte mit Einleitung, kritischem Apparat und Kommentar. Von GUSTAV SOYTER. (Kommentierte griechische und lateinische Texte herausgegeben von J. GEFFCKEN, 6.) Pp. xii + 68. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. M. 3.

THIS useful little collection of Byzantine poetry follows the same author's volume of prose extracts, *Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber und Chronisten*. It is divided into three sections: *Altbyzan-*

tinische Dichtung, Mittel- und spätbyzantinische Dichtung, and Die volkstümliche (früh-neugriechische) Dichtung der Frankenzeit, which carries us down to the fifteenth century. After the texts we have a section on the metres employed; especially interesting are the remarks on the Byzantine dodecasyllabic line, into which the iambic trimeter developed by the gradual decline of the sense of quantity and the growth of rules for the position of the accent. At

the end of the book is a short commentary on the extracts, with useful references. The selections themselves are many of them of great interest. Of Romanos we have the hymn on the Second Coming, with excellent notes: the complete edition of this finest of Byzantine poets, projected some years ago by Maas, unfortunately has not yet appeared. Of the 'Ακάθιστος Τυμος we have the splendid opening. How Greece itself fell back in the Middle Ages we are shown by the late tenth-century epigram on p. 24:

Οὐ βαρβάρων γῆν, ἀλλ' ἰδὼν τὴν Ἑλλάδα
ἐβαρβαρώθη καὶ λόγον καὶ τὸν τρόπον.

Though this was a literary commonplace, it no doubt reflected a fact. We find the sentiment in Philostratos, and Soyter prints too, on p. 27, a poem of Michael Akominatos on the desolation

of Athens, and he might have added that in a letter¹ Michael says the same: *βεβαρβάρωμαι χρόνιος ὧν ἐν Ἀθήναις*. On p. 33 is a very pretty imperial nuptial ode. With the third part we come down to extracts from the mixed Greco-Frankish romantic poems, and a few love-lyrics, hardly distinguishable from the popular verse of the present day. The little volume is warmly to be commended. It shows that there is much worth attention in a region of literature too often without sufficient evidence condemned; it also gives the reader the means for going further if he wishes.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College,
Oxford.

¹ For which see Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter*, Bk. I., Ch. VII.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1930.

GREEK LITERATURE.—M. Untersteiner, *Sofole, Edipo a Colono* [Turin, 1929. Pp. lxxvi + 436] (Morel). Scholarly and industrious. All possible previous interpretations collected and discussed. But text, which reviewer criticises in some detail, is too conservative owing to excessive respect for MS. tradition.—*Xenophon, Hellenica*. Rec. C. Hude [Leipzig, 1930, Teubner. Pp. x + 343] (Gemoll). Very careful piece of work, which will for long remain the standard text.—K. Huemer, *Das griechische Dreigestirn. Randbemerkungen zu griechischen Tragödien* [Vienna, 1930, C. Fromme. Pp. 100] (Eichenberg). H. goes his own ways. A stimulating book which compels thought, even if it often provokes disagreement.—K. Horna, *Die Hymnen des Mesomedes* [Sitz.-Ber. d. Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien, CCVII., i, 1928. Pp. 40] (Kalinka). First critical edition of eight new hymns with commentary, followed by discussion of the MS. The hymns previously known are printed in an appendix. Excellent.—*Luciani Dialogi meretricii*. In us. schol. ed. C. Mras. *Kleine Texte* herausg. v. H. Lietzmann 160 [Berlin, 1930. Pp. 56] (Helm). Very gratefully welcomed. Apparatus not only contains all the variants, but parallels for the language are given, vulgarisms noted, and references to modern literature on the subject quoted.—A. P. McMahon, *Seven questions on Aristotelian definitions of Tragedy*

and Comedy [Harvard Studies in Class. Philology, XL., 1929. Pp. 102] and M. T. Herrick, *The Poetics of Aristotle in England* [Cornell Studies in English, XVII., 1930. Pp. 196] (Gudeman). Two pieces of work as full of instruction as they are rich in content. LATIN LITERATURE.—*Horace. Tome I. Odes et épodes*. Texte ét. et trad. par F. Villeneuve [Paris, 1927, 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. lxxxvii + 470] (Hosius). One of the best editions in this series.—N. Wilsing, *Aufbau und Quellen von Ciceros Schrift 'De re publica'* [Leipzig Diss., 1929. Pp. 98] (Philippson). A credit to the late R. Heinze's school. Reviewer acknowledges indebtedness to W. even when he disagrees, and gives a detailed account of the contents.—M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliche lateinische Übersetzungen von Schriften der Aristoteles-Kommentatoren Johannes Philoponos, Alexander von Aphrodisias, und Themistios* [Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss. München, 1929. Pp. 72] (Gohlke). Distinguished by clear and balanced judgment.—N. Terzaghi, *Virgilio ed Enea* [Palermo, 1928. Pp. 191] (Aly). Character sketch of Aeneas, based mainly on an analysis of Aeneid, Bk. IV. A clear and objective study.—*Arte poetica di Orazio*. Introd. e comm. di A. Rostagni [Turin, 1930, Chiantore. Pp. cxii + 132] (Hosius). Introduction contains a clear and well-informed sketch of the history of the theory of poetry from Aristotle to Horace. The new fragments of Neoptolemus in Philodemus are worked into the commentary, of which they form an important and original part. A

- successful inaugural volume in the new Biblioteca di Filologia classica.
- HISTORY.**—L. Franz, *Vorgeschichtliches Leben in den Alpen* [Vienna, 1930, Schroll. Pp. 94, with 82 figures] (Philipp). Deals mainly with copper and salt mining. Very stimulating survey.—F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II.* Beihefte d. Histor. Ztschr. Nr. 19 [Munich, 1930, Oldenbourg. Pp. 155] (Lenschau). Based on careful use of the sources. Will have to be consulted by workers in this field.
- LANGUAGE.**—J. C. B. Eijkman, *Bijdrage tot de kennis der griekse toponymie* [Amsterdam, 1929. Pp. 96] (Kraemer). Valuable contribution to the study of Greek place-names.

—E. Flink-Linkomies, *De ablativo absoluto quaestiones* [Helsingfors, 1929, Annales Acad. Scient. Fenn., Ser. B, Tom. XX., i] (Stürmer). A model of scholarly work. Reviewer gives detailed account of contents.

ART.—K. Bulas, *Les illustrations antiques de l'Iliade.* Eus supp., vol. iii. [Lwów, 1929. Pp. 144, with 67 figures] (Lippold). On the whole a reliable guide to representations in art of the Iliad.

GENERAL.—J. L. Heiberg, *Fra Hellas og Italien.* 2 vols. [Copenhagen, 1929, Jespersen. Pp. xi + 496; 420] (Olsson). A collection of H.'s popular essays on a large variety of classical subjects (literature, art, medicine, etc.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

**** Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Bolaffi** (A.) *Vellei Paterculi ad M. Vinicium libro duo.* (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, N. 55.) Pp. xxvii + 181. Turin etc.: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 19.
- Cumont** (F.) *Die orientalischen Religionen im römischen Heidentum.* Nach der 4. französischen Auflage . . . bearbeitet von A. Burckhardt-Brandenberg. 3. Auflage. Mit 8 Doppeltafeln. Pp. xvi + 334. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931 (sic). Bound, RM. 14 (unbound, 12).
- Drerup** (E.) *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart.* Im Rahmen einer Allgemeinen Geschichte des griechischen Unterrichts. Erster Teil: Vom XV. bis zum Ende des XVII. Jahrhunderts. Pp. viii + 488. (Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums. Sechster Ergänzungsband.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1930. Paper.
- Drerup** (E.) *Perioden der klassische Philologie.* Grondslagen eener Geschiedenis van het Humanisme. Rectorale Rede. Pp. 48. Nijmegen-Utrecht: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1930. Paper, f. 1.
- Fitzhugh** (T.) *Triumphus-Θριαμβος.* The Indo-European or Pyrrhic Stress Accent in Antiquity, Its Rhythm, Meter, and Musical Tone. Pp. 207. (University of Virginia, Bulletin of the School of Latin, Second Series, Nos. 1-2, Whole Number 11-12.) Charlottesville, Va.: Anderson Brothers, 1930. Paper, \$5.
- Giarratano** (C.) *Q. Orazio Flacco. Il Libro degli Epodi.* Col commento di C. G. Pp. xiv + 131. Turin etc.: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 28.
- Giesecke** (W.) *Das Ptolemäergeld.* Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte des ägyptischen Münzwesens unter Berücksichtigung der Verhältnisse von Kyrene. Pp. v + 98; 4 plates. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 12 (unbound, 10).
- Moulton** (J. H.) and **Milligan** (G.) *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.* Pp. xxxii + 705. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930. £5 5s.
- Nestle** (W.) *Griechische Religiosität von Homer bis Pindar und Äschylos.* (Die gr. Rel. in ihren Grundzügen u. Hauptvertretern von Homer bis Proklos I.) Pp. 139. (Sammlung Göschen.) Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1930. Cloth, RM. 1.80.
- Richter** (G. M. A.) *Animals in Greek Sculpture.* A Survey. Pp. xii + 87; drawings, LXVI plates (236 figures). London: Milford, 1930. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Saunders** (C.) *Vergil's Primitive Italy.* Pp. 226. New York etc.: Oxford University Press, 1930. Cloth, \$3.
- Schroeder** (O.) *Aristophanis Cantica digessit stropharum popularium appendiculam adiecit O.S. Editio altera correctior anastatica magnam partem iterata.* Pp. 103. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 4.80 (unbound, 4.20).
- Schwahn** (W.) *Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps von Makedonien.* Pp. 63. (Klio, Beiheft XXI.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 4.50.
- Skard** (E.) *Index verborum quae exhibent Sallustii epistulae ad Caesarem.* Pp. 64. (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. Supplet. III.) Oslo: Some, 1930. Paper.
- Skimina** (S.) *État actuel des Études sur le Rythme de la Prose grecque II.* Pp. 96. (Eus Supplementa Vol. 11.) Lwów (Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres'), 1930. Paper, Kē. 10.
- Tarn** (W. W.) *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments.* Pp. 170. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 6s. net.
- van Liempt** (L.) *De Vocabulario Hymnorum Orphicorum atque Aetate.* Pp. 77. Purmerend: J. Muusses, 1930. Paper.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- ACCENT and stress, 5, 71
Adams (S. M.) Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 50: 162
Adler's Suidae Lexicon, *Paras I* noticed, 37
ad liquidum, 116
Agard's The Greek Tradition in Sculpture noticed, 196
Albertini's L'Empire Romain noticed, 78
Aly's Formprobleme der frühen griechischen Prosa noticed, 181
Anderson (W. B.) *Sum pius Aeneas*, 3
Apollonius and Virgil, 97
Aristophanes and Socrates, 69
Ashmole's A Catalogue of the Ancient Marbles at Ince Blundell Hall noticed, 149
Atkinson (D.) notice of Johnson's *The Roman Tribunal*, 42; of Perret's *La Titulature impériale d'Hadrien*, 43; of Warsher's *Pompeii in Three Hours*, 204
Atzert's Cicero, De officiis noticed, 25
auroids and bison, 83
Babbitt's Plutarch's Moralia, II. noticed, 82
Bacon (J. E.) notice of Schmid's *Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus*, 121
Bailey (C.) notice of Frazer's and of Landi's *P. Ovidii Nasonis Pastorum Libri Sex*, 235
Bailey's (K. C.) The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects noticed, 204
Barber (E. A.) notice of de Gubernatis' *Taciti Historiarum Libri III-IV*: 91
Barbour's Selections from Herodotus noticed, 140
Bates' Euripides, a Student of Human Nature noticed, 180
Baynes (N. H.) notice of Soyter's *Byzantinische Geschichtschreiber und Chronisten*, 44
Baynes' A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury and his memoir of Bury noticed, 38
Beare (W.) notice of Crusius' *Die Responsion in den Plautinischen Cantica*, 24. *Plautus, Rudens*, 109 (*occupatus occupat*), 62. Notice of a facsimile of the Ambrosian Codex of Virgil, 113. *Plautus and the fabula Atellana*, 165. Notice of books on *Plautus and Terence*, 186; of Fiore's *La Poesia di Virgilio*, 202; of Janell's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 202
beasts in battle, 169
Beazley's Attic Black-Figure noticed, 40
Bell (H. I.) notice of Westermann's *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 200; of Tait's *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library, etc.*, Vol. I., 201
Besika and Hissarlik, 161
Bethe's Homer, Dichtung und Sage, II noticed, 119; his *Die griechische Dichtung*, Parts 9-12 noticed, 197
Bevan (E. R.) notice of Willrich's *Das Haus des Herodes*, 22
Billson's Pindar's Odes of Victory, The Nemean and Isthmian Odes noticed, 197
Blakeney's Hymns of the Western Church noticed, 144
Bölle and others' Sparta noticed, 14
Bonner and Smith's The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle noticed, 227
BOOKS RECEIVED, 47, 94, 157, 207, 246
Borneque and Rabaud's Cicéron, Seconde Action contre Verres, V noticed, 25
Boulanger's Cicéron, Pour M. Fonteius, etc. noticed, 188
Bourgery and Ponchont's Lucain, Livres VI-X noticed, 136
Breuning's De Hymnorum Homericorum memoria noticed, 148
British Museum: Guides to the Exhibition of Roman Coins and to the Exhibition illustrating Greek and Roman Life noticed, 88
Brix-Niemeyer's Plantus' Captivi (Köhler) and Menaechmi (Conrad) noticed, 187
Broadhead (H. D.) *Plautus, Menaechmi III. iii. 2* (line 525): 12
Brock's Greek Medicine noticed, 90
Brooke's (D.) Private Letters Pagan and Christian noticed, 151
Brooke (Z. N.) notice of Buckler's *Anna Comnena*, 44
Brown's The Shorter Livy, Books XL-XLV noticed, 141
Buckler's Anna Comnena noticed, 44
Burnet's Essays and Addresses, and John Burnet (memoir), noticed, 125
Bury (J. B.): see Baynes.
Bury's (R. G.) Plato (Timaeus etc.) noticed, 127, 206
Butterworth (G. W.) notice of Dewing's *Procopius*, Vols. IV, V: 44
Byzantinische Zeitschrift (1930) noticed, 211
Calder (W. M.) notice of guides to British Museum exhibitions, and of *How to Observe in Archaeology*, 88; of Dinneen's *Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography*, 150
Campbell (A. Y.) *Aristophanes, Wasps 436-7*: 216
Campbell's (J. M.) The Greek Fathers noticed, 139
Carmina Hoeufftiana noticed, 144
Carpenter's The Sculpture of the Nike Temple Parapet noticed, 195
Cary (M.) notice of Albertini's *L'Empire Romain*, 78; of Glotz' *The Greek City and its Institutions*, 130; of Toutain's *The Economic Life of the Ancient World*, 179; of Bonner and Smith's *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, 227
Cary and Warmington's The Ancient Explorers noticed, 203
Casson (S.) *Cretan and Trojan émigrés*, 52
Castiglioni's Seneca: Tranquillita dell' Anima, etc. noticed, 203
Cesareo's Tito Livio, Liber XXVII noticed, 76; his *P. Terenzio, Il Punitore di se stesso* noticed, 188; his *Il Carme Natalizio nella Poesia Latina* noticed, 191
Charlesworth (M. P.) notice of Malcovati's *Caesaris Augusti Imperatoris Operum Fragmenta*, 33; of Longford's *Vespasian and Some of his Contemporaries*, 43; of Cary and Warmington's *The Ancient Explorers*, 226
Chilon, 15
Cicero and the Lex Gabinia, 224
Clark, Souter, and Adcock's memoir of J. S. Reid noticed, 38
Classical Association's meetings in London and Hull, 1, 49; proposed visit to S. Africa, 113
Classical Association of South Africa: Proceedings and Selected Papers noticed, 51
Classical Weekly summarized, 45, 93, 155
Cochrane's Thucydides and the Science of History noticed, 123
commissa piacula, 5, 170, 171
Constans' César, Guerre des Gaules noticed, 132
Conway's Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age noticed, 29; his *The Great Writers of Rome* noticed, 131.
See also Walters and Conway
Cornford (F. M.) *Plato, Theaetetus 209D*: 114

- Couch's *The Treasuries of the Greeks and Romans* noticed, 89
- Croiset's *Eschyle: Études sur l'invention dramatique dans son Théâtre* noticed, 196
- Crompton (W. M.) notice of Woolley's *Ur of the Chaldees*, 195
- Cron - Uhle - Struck's *Platon, Verteidigungsrede des Sokrates, Kriton* noticed, 139
- Crusius' *Die Responsion in den Plantinischen Cantica* noticed, 24
- Cyrene, edict of Augustus found at, 22
- Davies (G. A.) notice of Croiset's *Eschyle: Études sur l'invention dramatique dans son Théâtre*, 196
- Davidson (J. A.) Cicero and the *lex Gabinia*, 224
- Dawkins (R. M.) notice of Marshall's *Three Cretan Plays*, 206; of Mavrogordato's *The Erotokritos of Vincenzo Kornaros*, 206; of Soyter's *Byzantinische Dichtung: ausgewählte Texte*, etc., 244
- de Gubernatis' *Taciti Historiarum Libri III-IV* noticed, 91
- Demel's *Platons Verhältnis zur Mathematik* noticed, 17
- Denniston (J. D.) notice of Aly's *Formprobleme der frühen griechischen Prosa*, 181; of Usener and Radermacher's *Dionysius Halicarnasensis, Opuscula*, 203. Notes on the Greek particles, 213
- deus as vocative, 37
- Dewing's *Procopius, Vols. IV, V* noticed, 44
- Dinneen's *Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography* noticed, 150
- Dixon's *Hellas Revisited* noticed, 175
- Dodds (E. R.) notice of Kristeller's *Der Begriff der Seele in der Ethik des Plotin*, 153
- dolphins in art and literature, 185
- Doric fashions in Imperial times, 60
- Dottin's *Les Argonautiques d'Orphée* noticed, 232
- draucus and dracton, 114
- Duff (A. M.) notice of Stebbins' *The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome*, 185; of Herrlinger's *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung*, 244
- Duff (P. W.) notice of Kübler's *Gai Institutionum Commentarii Quattuor*, 43
- Duncan's *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* noticed, 192
- Düring's *Die Harmonielehre des Kladéos Polemaios* noticed, 242
- Duthie's *Readings from Tacitus: Germanicus* noticed, 141
- Eijkman's *Bijdrage tot de Kennis der Grieksche Toponymie* noticed, 148
- Elmer's *Latin Grammar* noticed, 34
- Enk's *Handboek der Latijnsche Letterkunde* noticed, 154
- Euripides' *Bacchae* played at Cambridge, 51
- Ferrabino's *La dissoluzione della libertà nella Grecia antica* noticed, 41
- Fiore's *La Poesia di Virgilio* noticed, 202
- Fiske's *Cicero's 'De Oratore' and Horace's 'Ars Poetica'* noticed, 188
- Fletcher (G. B. A.) notice of Oltramare's *Sénèque, Questions Naturelles, Tomes I, II*, and Kapnukajas' *Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas* etc., 137. Xenophon of Ephesus I. 4, 5: 174. Notice of Sabine and Smith's *M. Tullius Cicero, On the Commonwealth*, 201; of Sprey's *De M. Tullii Ciceronis Politica Doctrina*, 202; of Castiglioni's *Seneca: Della Tranquillità dell' Anima*, etc., 203
- Flinck-Linkomies' *De Ablativo Absoluto Quaestiones* noticed, 45
- Foerster's *Choricii Gazae Opera* noticed, 43
- Foligno's *Latin Thought during the Middle Ages* noticed, 92
- Fordyce (C. J.) notice of Wedeck's *Humour in Varro and other Essays*, 201
- Forster (E. S.) notice of Immisch's *Aristotelis Politica*, 19; of some verse translations, 146
- Forster's *L. Annaeus Florus* noticed, 194
- Fossing's *The Thorvaldsen Museum: Catalogue of the Antique Engraved Gems and Cameos* noticed, 149
- Foster's *Livy, XXI-XXII* noticed, 203
- Fotheringham (J. K.) The two-thousandth anniversary of Virgil's birth, 1. Notice of Helm's *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik*, 243
- Fraenkel's *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers* noticed, 71
- Fraser (J.) notice of Goldmann's *Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache*, 151; of Krahe's *Lexicon Altillyrischer Personennamen*, 200
- Frazer's *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex* noticed, 235
- Frazer and Van Buren's *Græcia Antiqua* noticed, 175
- Frutiger's *Les Mythes de Platon* noticed, 197
- Gardiner (E. N.) A school in Ptolemaic Egypt, 211. Obituary notice, 209
- Gardner (R.) notice of Platner and Ashby's *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* and Lundström's *Undersökningar i Roms Topografi*, 142
- Garrido (I. M.) Note on Petronius' *Satyricon* 135: 10
- Gaselee (S.) notice of Kuhnmuensch's *Early Christian Latin Poets from the Fourth to the Sixth Century*, 85; of recent compositions and translations, 144
- Genner (E. E.) notice of Walters and Conway's *T. Livii Libri XXI-XXV*, 134
- Giarratano's *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI* noticed, 80
- Gillies (M. M.) notice of Dottin's *Les Argonautiques d'Orphée*, 232
- Glötz' *The Greek City and its Institutions* noticed, 130
- Glover's *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World* noticed, 150
- Goldmann's *Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache* noticed, 151
- Gomme (A. W.) notice of Hommel's *Heliaia*, 64; of Cochrane's *Thucydides and the Science of History*, 123; of Tarn's *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 150
- gonfus, 116
- Gow (A. S. F.) A Theocritean crux, 9. Notice of Koerte's *Hellenistic Poetry*, 90; of Ashmole's *A Catalogue of the Ancient Marbles at Ince Blundell Hall* and Fossing's *The Thorvaldsen Museum: Catalogue of the Antique Engraved Gems and Cameos*, 149; of Lamb's *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Fitzwilliam Museum*, 195; of Carpenter's *The Sculpture of the Nike Temple Parapet*, 195; of Agard's *The Greek Tradition in Sculpture*, 196; of Hunt and Johnson's *Two Theocritus Papyri*, 228
- Greenwood's *Cicero: The Verrine Orations, Vol. I* noticed, 42
- Gulick's *Athenaeus, II, III* noticed, 82
- Guthrie (W. K. C.) Epithets in the Orphic Hymns, 216
- Haarhoff (A. I.) *Pius Aeneas*, 62. (With A. I. Wagner) Vergil, Aeneid VI. 567-569: 170
- Hackforth (E.) notice of Novotny's *Platonis Epistulas commentariis illustratae*, 198
- Häfner's *Die literarischen Pläne Ciceros* noticed, 25
- Halliday (W. B.) notice of Homo's *Roman Political Institutions from City to State*, 77; of Glover's *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World*, 150
- Harden (D. B.) notice of Trowbridge's *Philological Studies in Ancient Glass*, 154
- Harder's *Ueber Ciceros Somnium Scipionis* noticed, 188
- Hardie and Gaye's translation of Aristotle's *Physica* noticed, 182
- Harrison (E.) notice of Mair's *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus, Gulick's Athenaeus, II, III*, Babbitt's *Plutarch's Moralia, II*, 82; of Täubler's *Die Archæologie des Thukydides* and Ziegler's *Thukydides und die Weltgeschichte*, 89

Heath (T. L.) *der Mather*

Heisenberg

Heitland (V.) *the Works*

and of a

Helm's *Hie*

ticed, 243

Henry (R. M.)

Herbillon's

Herkenrath

noticed, 6

Herrlinger's

noticed, 243

Hesseling (I.)

I. 24: 59

Hill (H.) *Ta*

Hissarlik, 1

Hobbes' *Th*

of Thucyd

Hommel's

Homo's *Ro*

noticed,

Housman (J.)

Notice of

VI-X, 13

234

How to Obs

Hude's *Xen*

Hunt and J

Husband (J.)

and Chris

Hutton (D)

Hutton's (M)

ticed, 14

Hyde and

Immisch's

Janell's *P*

recognita

Jonkins (E.)

Jews in Gr

Johnson's

Johnson (S.)

XXVII,

cours de

Jones's *A*

noticed,

Jullian's *A*

Kapnukajas

ticed, 13

Klibansky

ticed, 92

Knight (W.)

Koerte's *E*

Krahe's *L*

noticed,

Kruebler's

ticed, 4

Kuhnmu

Fourth

Laistner (G.)

Isocrate,

Vol. 2:

Lamb (W.)

of Smit

Lamb's *C*

Corpus

noticed

Landi's *P*

235

Laurand's

- Heath (T. L.) notice of *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik*, Abt. B, Bd. 1, Heft 1, 42
- Heisenberg, Festgabe to, 211
- Hestland (W. E.) notice of Baynes' *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury* and his memoir of Bury, and of a memoir of J. S. Reid, 38
- Helm's *Hieronymus' Zusätze in Eusebius' Chronik* noticed, 243
- Henry (R. M.) *Medea and Dido*, 97
- Herbillon's *Les Cultes de Patras* noticed, 199
- Herkenrath's *Der ethische Aufbau der Ilias und Odyssee* noticed, 63
- Herrlinger's *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung* noticed, 244
- Hesseling (D. C.) On Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists* I. 24: 59
- Hill (H.) Tacitus, *Histories* I. 42: 117
- Hissarliik, 161
- Hobbes' *The Funeral Oration of Pericles translated out of Thucydides* noticed, 144
- Hommel's *Heliaia* noticed, 64
- Homo's *Roman Political Institutions from City to State* noticed, 77
- Housman (A. E.) *Draucus and Martial* XI 81: 114. Notice of Bourgety and Ponchont's *Lucain, Livres VI-X*, 136; of Vollmer-Morel's *Appendix Vergiliana*, 234
- How to Observe in Archaeology noticed, 88
- Hude's *Xenophontis Historia Graeca* noticed, 124
- Hunt and Johnson's *Two Theocritus Papyri* noticed, 228
- Husband (J.) notice of Brooke's *Private Letters Pagan and Christian*, 151
- Hutton (Dr. M.), 1
- Hutton's (N. K.) *Gaisford Greek Prize Composition* noticed, 144
- Hyde and Weist's *Menaechmi of Plautus* noticed, 187
- Immisch's *Aristotelis Politica* noticed, 19
- Janell's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. maior iterum recognita noticed, 202
- Jenkins (E. D. T.) *Bdōs and ūpos* in Longinus 2. 1: 174
- Jews in Greek cities, 22
- Johnson's (H. D.) *The Roman Tribunal* noticed, 42
- Johnson (S. K.) notice of Cesareo's *Tito Livio, Liber XXVII*, 76; of Ullmann's *Étude sur le Style des Discours de Tite Live*, 240
- Jones's *A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede* noticed, 153
- Jullian's *Au Seuil de notre Histoire* noticed, 205
- Kapnukajas' *Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas* etc. noticed, 137
- Klibansky's *Ein Proklosfund und seine Bedeutung* noticed, 92
- Knight (W. F. J.) Vergil, *Aeneid* VI. 567-569: 5
- Koerte's *Hellenistic Poetry* noticed, 90
- Krahe's *Lexicon Altillyrischer Personennamen* noticed, 200
- Kristeller's *Der Begriff der Seele in der Ethik des Plotin* noticed, 153
- Kuebler's *Gai Institutionum Commentarii Quattuor* noticed, 43
- Kuhnmuench's *Early Christian Latin Poets from the Fourth to the Sixth Century* noticed, 85
- Laistner (M. L. W.) notice of Mathieu and Brémond's *Isocrate, Discours, Tome I* and Norlin's *Isocrates*, Vol. 2: 66
- Lamb (W.) notice of Beazley's *Attic Black-Figure*, 40; of Smith's *New Aspects of the Menon Painter*, 196
- Lamb's *Greek and Roman Bronzes* noticed, 87; her *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, Fitzwilliam Museum noticed, 195
- Landi's *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri VI* noticed, 235
- Laurand's *Cicéron est intéressant* noticed, 142
- Laurence (Sir P. M.): bequest to Cambridge, 113
- Leslie's *The Greek Anthology selected and translated with a Prolegomenon* noticed, 86
- Levens' *A Book of Latin Letters* noticed, 142
- L'Italia Antichissima noticed, 211
- Livingstone (R. W.) notice of Sargeant's *Classical Studies*, Burnet's *Essays and Addresses*, and a memoir of Burnet, 125
- Longford's *Vespasian and Some of his Contemporaries* noticed, 43
- Lorimer (H. L.) notice of Bethe's *Homer, Dichtung und Sage*, II, 119
- Lowe's *Regula S. Benedicti* noticed, 153
- Lucas (D. W.) notice of Mozley's *Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems*, 233; of Schaster's *Tibull-Studien*, 233
- Lundström's *Undersökningar i Roms Topografi* noticed, 142
- Macan's *The Collects . . . rendered into Latin Verse* noticed, 144
- Mackay (L. A.) notice of Villeneuve's *Horace, Odes et Épodes*, 190
- McKenzie (E.) notice of Eijkman's *Bijdrage tot de Kennis der Grieksche Toponymie*, 148; of Enk's *Handboek der Latijnsche Letterkunde*, 154; of Donum *Natalicium Schrijnen*, 155
- Mair's *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus* noticed, 82
- Malcovati's *Caesaris Augusti Imperatoris Operum Fragmenta* noticed, 33
- Marchant (E. C.) notice of Hude's *Xenophontis Historia Graeca*, 124
- Marchant and Watson's *Latin Prose Composition* noticed, 141
- Marshall's *Three Cretan Plays* noticed, 206
- Martha's *Cicéron, Des Termes extrêmes des Biens et des Maux* noticed, 74, 230
- Martin and Richards' *Aspects of Greek Life* noticed, 140
- Mathieu and Brémond's *Isocrate, Discours, Tome I* noticed, 66
- Mattingly (E.) The date of Virgil's death: a numismatic contribution, 57. Notice of Lamb's *Greek and Roman Bronzes*, 87
- Mavragdato's *The Erotokritos of Vincenzo Kornaros* noticed, 206
- May's translation of the *Aeneid* noticed, 146
- Medea and Dido, 97
- Meillet's *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine* noticed, 23
- Middleton (G.) notice of Foerster's *Choricii Gazaei Opera*, 43
- Monro's *Livy, Book XXV* noticed, 141
- Moon (B. O.) notice of Brock's *Greek Medicine*, 90; of Bailey's *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects*, 204
- Mountford (J. F.) notice of Düring's *Die Harmonielehre des Klaudios Ptolemaios*, 242
- Mozley's *Ovid: The Art of Love and Other Poems* noticed, 233
- Muir (J. T.) *Oratio obliqua*—future perfect indicative in conditional clauses in primary sequence, 12
- Müller's *Stilistische Untersuchung der Epinomis des Philippos von Opus* noticed, 41
- Muller (F.) and Renkema's *Be knoopt Latijnsch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek* noticed, 147
- Muller's (H. F.) *A Chronology of Vulgar Latin* noticed, 152
- Mure (G. R. G.) notice of Wicksteed and Cornford's and Hardie and Gaye's translations of Aristotle's *Physics*, 182
- Murray (G.) Pitch accent and metrical stress, 5. Notice of Schroeder's *Euripidis Cantica*, 16; of Woodhouse's *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey*, 118; of Weber's *Euripides Alkestis*, 149
- Murray's translation of the *Oresteia* noticed, 146
- Musée Belge summarized, 93, 155

- Mylonas' Excavations at Olynthus, Part I, The Neolithic Settlement** noticed, 70
- Mynors (R. A. B.)** notice of Conway's *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age*, 29
- Nestle's Die Struktur des Eingangs in der Attischen Tragödie** noticed, 199
- Newell (A. N.)** notice of Jullian's *Au Seuil de notre Histoire*, 205
- Nock (A. D.)** *The Rhesus*, 173
- Norlin's Isocrates, Vol. 2** noticed, 66
- Novotny's Platonis Epistulae commentariis illustratae** noticed, 198
- numen**, 239
- Nutting (H. C.)** Tacitus, *Hist. I. 22. 1*: 117. Tacitus, *Ag. 9. 3*: 118
- occupatos occupat*, 62
- Olivieri's Frammenti della Commedia Greca e del Mimo nella Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia** noticed, 149
- Oltremare's Sénèque, Questions Naturelles, t. I, II** noticed, 137
- Onians (R. E.)** notice of Herkenrath's *Der ethische Aufbau der Ilias und Odyssee*, 63. Lucretius V. 1308-1340: 163
- oratio obliqua*, future perfect indicative, 12
- Orr (J.)** notice of Muller's *A Chronology of Vulgar Latin*, 152
- Osmaston's A New Presentation of Greek Art and Thought** noticed, 144
- Owen (A. S.)** notice of Bates' *Euripides, A Student of Human Nature*, 180
- Paganelli's Propece** noticed, 75
- Palaeographia Latina, VI** noticed, 154
- Pantin (W. E. F.)** notice of Elmer's *Latin Grammar*, 34
- Pearson (A. C.)** Aesch. *Agam.* 1525 ff.: 55
- Perret's La Titulature impériale d'Hadrien** noticed, 43
- Perry's translation of Terence** noticed, 146
- Philologische Wochenschrift** summarized, 45, 93, 156, 207, 245
- picula*, 5, 170, 171
- Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.)** notice of Olivieri's *Frammenti della Commedia Greca e del Mimo*, 149; of Nestle's *Die Struktur des Eingangs in der Attischen Tragödie*, 199
- pius Aeneas*, 3, 62
- Plasberg's Cicero, De virtutibus** noticed, 25
- Platner and Ashby's A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome** noticed, 142
- Plautus's use of responson**, 24
- Porter's The Rhesus of Euripides** noticed, 173
- Post (L. A.)** Plato, *Epistle VI* 322D: 116
- Post's Menander: Three Plays** noticed, 197
- Powell (J. U.)** notice of Leslie's *The Greek Anthology selected and translated*, 86. Sophocles, *Antigone*, 1302-3: 116
- Prümm's Quaestionum Tullianarum . . . specimen** noticed, 188
- Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik, Abt. B, Bd. 1, Heft 1* noticed, 42
- Baby (F. J. E.)** notice of Foligno's *Latin Thought during the Middle Ages*, 92
- Rackham (H.)** Version from D'Aubigné (into Latin hendecasyllables), 161. Notices of Martha's *Cicéron, Des Termes extrêmes des Biens et des Maux*, 74, 230; of Souilhé and Cruchon's *Aristote, L'Ethique Nic., Livres I et II*, 184. *Nugae elegiacae*, 225
- Rand's Studies in the Script of Tours, I** noticed, 205
- Reid (J. S.)** memoir of, noticed, 38
- Reis' Cicero, Or. de imperio Cn. Pompei and Or. in L. Catilinam IV** noticed, 25
- responson in Plautus**, 24
- Richards (G. C.)** *The Hollows of Euboea*, 61
- Richardson (L. J. D.)** notice of Constans' *César, Guerre des Gaules*, 132
- Richmond's Sexti Propertii quae supersunt omnia** noticed, 30
- Robertson (D. S.)** notice of Schadewaldt's *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion*, 40; of Giarratano's *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI*, 80; of Billson's *Pindar's Odes of Victory, The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*, 197; of Bethé's *Die griechische Dichtung (Parts 9-12)*, 197
- Robin's Platon, Le Banquet** noticed, 68
- Rocco's Carmi latini editi ed inediti** noticed, 144
- Rolfe's Cornelius Nepos** noticed, 194
- Rose (H. J.)** notice of Willoughby's *Pagan Regeneration*, 91; of Herbillon's *Les cultes de Patras*, 199
- Ross's Aristotle, Selections, and parts of The Works of Aristotle** (ed. Ross), noticed, 20
- Rostagni's Arte poetica di Orazio** noticed, 188
- Sabine and Smith's M. Tullius Cicero, On the Commonwealth** noticed, 201
- Sargeant's Classical Studies** noticed, 125
- Schadewaldt's Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion** noticed, 40
- Schmid's Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus** noticed, 121
- Schmid and Stählin's Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, I, i**, noticed, 12
- Schrijnen: Donum Natalicium Schrijnen** noticed, 155
- Schroeder's Euripidis Cantica** noticed, 16
- Schuster's Tibull-Studien** noticed, 233
- Sedgwick (W. B.)** *Again the Bacchae*, 6. *Confossioem soricina nemi*, 56
- Semple (W. H.)** notice of Foster's *Livy XXI-XXII*, 203
- Shewan (A.)** *Hissariik*, 161
- Sinclair (T. A.)** notice of Schmid and Stählin's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, I, i*: 12
- Smiley (M. T.)** notice of Breunings' *De Hymnorum Homericorum memoria*, 148
- Smith's New Aspects of the Menon Painter** noticed, 196
- Souilhé and Cruchon's Aristote, L'Ethique Nic., Livres I et II** noticed, 184
- Souter (A.)** notice of Flinck-Linkomies' *De Ablativo Absoluto Quaestiones*, 45; of Waltzing and Severyns' *Tertullien, Apologétique*, 82; of Vollebregt's *Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitarum editionem*, 91. Cicero, *Epist. XI*, 27, § 7: 116. Statius, *Silvae IV*, 3, 48: 116. Notice of Muller and Renkema's *Beknopt Latijnsch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, 147; of Jones's *A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede*, 153; of Lowe's *Regula S. Benedicti*, 153; of Palaeographia Latina, Part VI, 154. Lucan V. 197: 174. Notice of Rand's *Studies in the Script of Tours, I*, 205
- Soyter's Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber und Chronisten** noticed, 44; his *Byz. Dichtung, ausgewählte Texte* noticed, 244
- Spranger (J. A.)** *The Bacchae* again, 56
- Sprey's De M. Tullii Ciceronis Politica Doctrina** noticed, 202
- Stawell's translation of Euripides, Iphigenia in Aulis** noticed, 146
- Stebbins' The Dolphin in the Literature and Art of Greece and Rome** noticed, 185
- Stewart (H.)** notice of Richmond's *Sexti Propertii quae supersunt omnia*, 30; of Greenwood's *Cicero: The Verrine Orations, Vol. I*, 42; of Paganelli's *Propece*, 75
- Stocks (J. L.)** notice of parts of *The Works of Aristotle* (ed. Ross) and of Ross's *Aristotle, Selections*, 20; of Müller's *Stilistische Untersuchung der Epinomis des Philippos von Opus*, 41
- Stuart Jones (H.)** notice of Adler's *Suidas Lexicon, Pars I*, 37
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS**, 45, 93, 155, 207, 245
- Supplément critique au Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé, I noticed, 114**

Tait's *Greek* noticed,
Tarn's *History* noticed,
Tarrant (J.)
Taubler's
Taylor (A.)
Mathem
of Kliba
92; of I
Frutiger
Thierfeld
narum n
Thomsen'
187
Thomson
Ministry
Thomson
Thucydidi
Tod (M. N.)
libertà n
de la Me
Toronto b
Toutain's
noticed,
tribunal pr
Trowbrid
noticed,
Turner (J.)
Histoire
und Aht
Ullmann's
noticed,
Usener a
Opuscula
Valmin's
Vellay's
noticed,
Villeneuve
Virgil: bi
of his
4th Eclo
113
Vollebreg
noticed,
Vollmer-N

Wace (A.)
Olynthus
Couch's

Note:—
author or

Aeschylu
121. S
Apolloni
Apuleius
Aristoph
436-7:
Aristotle
184. F
949b 20
Athenaeu

Caesar B
passim
Cairo Pap
Papyri

Tait's *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library, etc.*, Vol. I noticed, 201
 Tarn's *Hellenistic Civilization* noticed, 150
 Tarrant (D.) *Hyperides, Epitaphios*, §20 (Col. 8); 62
 Taubler's *Die Archæologie des Thukydides* noticed, 89
 Taylor (A. E.) notice of Demel's *Platons Verhältnis zur Mathematik*, 17; of Robin's *Platon, Le Banquet*, 68; of Klubansky's *Ein Prohlosfund und seine Bedeutung*, 92; of Bury's *Plato (Timæus etc.)*, 127 (cf. 206); of Frutiger's *Les Mythes de Platon*, 197
 Thierfelder's *De Rationibus Interpolationum Plautinarum* noticed, 186
 Thomsen's *Pleonasmus bei Plautus und Terentius* noticed, 187
 Thomson (G. T.) notice of Duncan's *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, 192
 Thomson (H. J.) *The Psychomachia of Prudentius*, 109
 Thucydides and Hippocrates, 123
 Tod (M. N.) notice of Ferrabino's *La dissoluzione della libertà nella Grecia antica*, 41; of Valmin's *Inscriptions de la Messénie*, 89
 Toronto honour classical course, 1
 Toutain's *The Economic Life of the Ancient World* noticed, 179
 tribunal praetorium and the 'Aurelian tribunal', 42
 Trowbridge's *Philological Studies in Ancient Glass* noticed, 154
 Turner (R. L.) notice of Meillet's *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine*, 23; of Fraenkel's *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers*, 71
 Ullmann's *Étude sur le Style des Discours de Tite Live* noticed, 240
 Usener and Radermacher's *Dionysius Halicarnasens, Opuscula* noticed, 203
 Valmin's *Inscriptions de la Messénie* noticed, 89
 Vellay's *Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie* noticed, 162
 Villeneuve's *Horace, Odes et Épodes* noticed, 190
 Virgil: bimillenary, 1, 113, 209; his farm, 30; dates of his birth and death, 1, 57; the child in the 4th *Eclogue*, 59; facsimile of the Ambrosian Codex, 113
 Vollebregt's *Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitarum editionem* noticed, 91
 Vollmer-Morel's *Appendix Vergiliana* noticed, 234
 Wace (A. J. B.) notice of Mylonas' *Excavations at Olynthus, Part I, The Neolithic Settlement*, 70; of Couch's *The Treasures of the Greeks and Romans*, 89

Wade-Gery (H. T.) notice of *Sparta* (from Pauly-Wissowa, R.E.), 14. A note on Kleon's finance, 163
 Wagenvoort's *Vergils Vierte Ekloge und das Sidus Iulium* noticed, 151
 Wagner (A. I.) and Haarloff (T. J.) *Vergil, Aeneid VI*, 567-569: 170
 Walker's *Les Fragments d'Épicharme* noticed, 146
 Walters and Conway's *T. Livii Libri XXI-XXV* noticed, 134
 Waltzing and Severyns' *Tertullien, Apologétique* noticed, 82
 Warsher's *Pompeii in Three Hours* noticed, 204
 Watson (E. W.) notice of Campbell's *The Greek Fathers*, 139
 Way's translations of Bacchylides and Virgil *Aeneid VII-XII* noticed, 146
 Weber's *Euripides Alkestis* noticed, 149
 Webster (T. B. L.) notices of Ciceroniana, 25; of Ciceroniana and Horatiana, 188. The gap in the *Pro Flacco*, 221
 Wedeck's *Humour in Varro and other Essays* noticed, 201
 Wendt's *Ciceros Brief an Pactus* noticed, 25
 Westermann's *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* noticed, 200
 Wicksteed and Cornford's *Aristotle: The Physics* noticed, 182
 Wight Duff (J.) notice of Conway's *The Great Writers of Rome*, 131; of Cesareo's *Il Carme Natalizio nella Poesia Latina*, 191
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *My Recollections* noticed, 210
 Williamson (H.) notices of some class-books, 139
 Willoughby's *Pagan Regeneration* noticed, 91
 Willrich's *Das Haus des Herodes* noticed, 22
 Witton (W. F.) *Commissa piacula* (Vergil, *Aeneid VI*, 569), 171
 Wood (E. J.) notice of Wagenvoort's *Vergils Vierte Ekloge und das Sidus Iulium*, 151; of Forster's *L. Annaeus Florus und Rolfe's Cornelius Nepos*, 194
 Woodhouse's *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey* noticed, 118
 Woodward (A. M.) notice of Dixon's *Hellas Revisited* and Frazer and Van Buren's *Græcia Antiqua*, 175
 Woolley's *Ur of the Chaldees* noticed, 195
 Yorke (E. C.) *Aristophanes, Clouds*, 520 ff.: 165
 Ziegler's *Cicero De re publica* noticed, 25; his *Thukydides und die Weltgeschichte* noticed, 89

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given page.

Aeschylus *Agam.* 50: 162; 1525 ff.: 55. *P. V.* passim: 121. *Supp.* 392: 213
 Apollonius Rhodius *Arg.* passim: 97
 Apuleius *Met.* passim: 80
 Aristophanes *Cl.* 520 ff.: 165. *Wasps* 233, 661: 66; 436-7: 216
 Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 63-69: 64. *Eth. N. I.*, II. passim: 184. *Phys.* passim: 182. *Pol.* passim: 20. *Probl.* 949b 20, 954a 11: 21
 Athenæus 107-330 passim: 84
 Caesar *B. Civ.* I. 26, 4: 12. *B. Gall.* VII. 77, 8: 12; passim: 132
 Cairo Papyri (=Cat. gen. . . du Musée du Caire: *Zenon Papyri I.*, II., III.) 59060 and passim: 211

Cicero *Ad Att.* I. 10. 6: 224; I. 11, 2: 224. *Ad Fam.* II. 6, 5: 12; IX. 22: 26; XI. 27, 7: 116; XVI. 2: 12. *De Fin.* I., II. passim: 74; III.-V. passim: 230. *De Off.* passim: 27. *De Rep.* passim: 27. *In Cat.* passim: 28. *In Verr.* passim: 43. *Pro Flacco* passim: 221. *Pro Leg. Man.* I. 2: 224; passim: 27. *Tusc. Disp.* II. 14, 32: 12
 Clemens Alex. *Paed.* II. 10: 57
 Colluthus 134: 83

Dio Chrysostom *Or.* VII. 2: 61

Euripides *Alc.* passim: 149; 1126-7: 214. *Bac.* passim: 6. *Cycl.* 65 ff.: 16; 261: 214. *El.* 567 f.: 214. *Hel.* 124: 213. *Ion* 494: 16. *Or.* 1091-4: 215
 [Euripides] *Rhes.* 595-674: 173

Herodotus I. 65 f.: 15; VIII. 14: 61
 Hieronymus *Chron. Can.*, pp. 234, 235 (Foth.): 2

Horace *Odes* and *Epodes* passim: 190
Hymn. Orph. passim: 216
 Hyperides *Epitaph.* § 20: 62

I.G. I³. 324: 163

Livy II. 49: 5; XXVII. passim: 76; XXXI. 47: 61
 Longinus 2, 1: 174
 Lucan V. 197: 174; VI.-X. passim: 136
 Lucretius V. 1308 ff.: 169
 Lysias XXIX. 4: 214

Martial XI. 8, 1: 114

Oppian *Cyn.* II. 160: 83. *Hal.* passim: 83
 Ovid *Amores* III. 6, 39 ff.: 226. *Ars am.* passim: 233.
Fasti passim: 235. *Met.* VIII. passim: 11

P(ap.) S(oc.) I(tal.) 418: 212

Pausanias V. 17, 2, VI. 19, 14: 14

Petronius 135: 10

Philostratus *Vit. Soph.* I. 24: 59

Plato *Ep.* II. 314C: 198; IV. 320D: 129; VI. 322D:
 116; VII. 339D: 129; 351C, 352A: 128. *Symp.* passim:
 68. *Theaet.* 209D: 114. *Tim.* passim: 127, 206

Plautus passim: 24. *Bacch.* 887 ff.: 56. *Men.* 452:
 62; 525: 12. *Rudens* 109: 62; 485 ff.: 165

Plutarch *Mor.* 86B-171F passim: 85
 Propertius passim: 30, 75
 Prosper Tiro *Chron. Min.* I., p. 404: 2
 Prudentius *Psychom.* passim: 109

Seneca *H.F.* and *Med.* passim: 138. *Qu. Nat.* passim:
 137. *Tranq.* and *Brev.* passim: 203
 Sophocles *Ant.* 321: 213; 1302-3: 116. *Ant.* 659 ff.
Aj. 182 ff., *El.* 179 f.: 215
 Statius *Silv.* IV. 3, 48: 116
 Strabo VII. 4, 2: 226

Tacitus *Agv.* 9, 3: 117. *Hist.* I. 22, 1, I. 42: 116
 III. 66, 5-7: 92
 Theocritus I. 45 ff.: 9; passim: 228
 Thucydides III. 113, 4: 213
 Tibullus I. 7, 57 ff., II. 6, 39 f.: 225
 Tryphiodorus 2: 83

Virgil *Aen.* I. 378: 3, 62; IV. 393: 4 n.; IV passim:
 97. VI. 567-9: 5, 170, 171. *Appendix Verg.* passim:
 234. *Catalepton* X. 23-5: 42. *Ecl.* IV. passim: 59,
 152. *Georg.* IV. 559 ff.: 58

Xenophon *Hell.* passim: 124
 Xenophon *Ephes.* I. 4, 5: 174

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

αἶρω, 55
 ἀκρατίζεσθαι, 9
 ἄλλομαι: aorist forms, 125
 ἄλλος λόγος, 21
 ἄμματα, 83
 ἀναγορεύειν, 165
 ἀναξυνοῦσθαι, 124
 ἀνεπίδεικτος, 62
 ἀντροβίατος, 219
 ἀποπαιδαριῶν, 213

βάθος, 174
 γάρ, 214, 215
 γόμφος, γόνφος, 116
 δρακόν, 115
 δωριάζειν, δωρίζειν, 60
 ἐγδοχεύς, 180
 θιασώτης, 175
 καθίκεν, 10
 Κόλλα, 61
 κρησφύγετον, 53

Μεδόντας, 14
 νικηφόροι, 221
 οὐκουν . . . γε, 213
 οὐκουν δὴ, 214
 οὐν δὴ, 214
 παιδάριον, 212
 πρόφασις, 123
 τραγῶνες ὀπισθόκεντροι, 84
 ὕψος, 174

at. passim;

174 659 ff.

I. 42: 116

IV passim:

174. passim:

passim: 59.

3

174, 84